The Dissertation Committee for Bokyung Murray Certifies that this is the approved version of the following dissertation:

Self-Determination Theory in a Collectivist Educational Context:

Motivation of Korean Students Studying English as a Foreign Language

Committee

Elaine K. Horwitz, Supervisor

Frank W. Wicker, Co-Supervisor

Diane L. Schallert

Keith Walters

Robert M. Oppenheim

Self-Determination Theory in a Collectivist Educational Context: Motivation of Korean Students Studying English as a Foreign Language

by

Bokyung Murray, B.A.; M.S.

Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at Austin

In Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements

For the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Texas at Austin

May, 2005

Dedication

To my Mother and Father

Acknowledgements

There are many people I would like to thank for their assistance in writing this dissertation. There are a few who I would like to specifically thank here.

I appreciated very much the guidance and direction given to me from inception to conclusion by the co-supervisors of my dissertation committee, Dr. Elaine K. Horwitz and Dr. Frank W. Wicker. They willingly gave of their time and ensured that I remained focused on the task at hand. I should also like to thank the other members of my committee, Dr. Diane L. Schallert, Dr. Keith Walters, and Dr. Robert M. Oppenheim, who provided feedback and perspective as the dissertation developed.

I also appreciated the support and cooperation of the middle school teachers in Seoul, Korea, who allowed me access to their students for the purpose of accumulating data for this study, and of course I thank the students themselves who took the time to participate in the surveys.

I would be remiss if I did not give a word of thanks to my mother and father, who instilled in me a lifelong love of learning; and last but certainly not least, to my husband John for his encouragement and for being a source of strength to me during this project.

Self-Determination Theory in a Collectivist Educational Context: Motivation of Korean Students Studying English as a Foreign Language

Publication No._____

Bokyung Murray, PhD

The University of Texas at Austin, 2005

Supervisors: Elaine K. Horwitz and Frank W. Wicker

The focus of this study was classroom motivation of Korean middle school students studying English as a Foreign Language (EFL), from the perspective of self-determination theory (SDT).

Five research questions were addressed: (1) What is the motivational pattern of Korean middle school students learning English as a foreign language, from a SDT perspective, as measured by the Self-Regulation Questionnaire-Academic (SRQ-A)? (2) What is the correlation between the results of SRQ-A and these students' self-report of classroom achievement in English? (3) How do these students perceive their parental involvement and support for their autonomy, as measured by the Perceptions of Parents Scales (POPS)? (4) What is the correlation between the results of POPS and these students' self-report of classroom achievement in English? (5) What are the correlations among scales and subscales of the SRQ-A and the POPS?

A total of 167 students, ages 13-16 years, studying EFL at two middle schools in Seoul, Korea, participated in this study. Three survey instruments were used in this

investigation: the Self-Regulation Questionnaire-Academic to assess student motivational patterns; the Perceptions of Parents Scales to measure student perceptions of parental involvement and support to their autonomy; and a Self-Report of Classroom Achievement Questionnaire.

A quantitative analysis was performed on the data collected, and findings indicated that the motivational pattern of these students was mainly extrinsic, at the identified level of self-regulation. Intrinsic motivation was the least often mentioned reason for studying English for these students. Student perceptions of parental involvement and support to autonomy were reported to be low for these students. These results are similar to studies done in western cultures, and may attest to the possibility of the universal applicability of self-determination theory.

The relationship of these students' motivational patterns and perceptions of parental involvement to their self-reported classroom achievement is also presented, and the study concludes with a discussion of pedagogical implications.

Table of Contents

List of Tables x

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION 1

Theories of Motivation within Traditional Psychology 3

Theories of Motivation within Educational Psychology 6

Theories of Motivation within Second Language Learning 7

Self-Determination Theory 9

Purpose of the Study 18

Research Questions 20

Significance of the Study 20

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW 24

Gardner's Socio-Educational Model of Second Language Motivation 24

Self-Determination Theory and Second Language Motivation 33

Studies on Basic Concepts of SDT Theory 34

Studies of Second Language Learning from a SDT Perspective 40

Studies Done in Asian Contexts from a SDT Perspective 45

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY 50

Setting and Participants 51

Research Instruments 52

Self-Regulation Questionnaire-Academic 53

Perceptions of Parents Scales 55

Data Analysis 56

Translation of the Instruments 57

CHAPTER 4: RESULTS OF DATA ANALYSIS 59

Research Question #1 59

Research Question #3 62

Research Question #2 68

Research Question #4 68

Research Question #5 69
Results from self-report of achievement questionnaire 70
SRQ-A question #33 71

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSIONS, PEDAGOGIC IMPLICATIONS AND LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY 72
Discussion of Principal Findings of this Study 73
Conclusion 77
Pedagogical Implications 78
Limitations of the Study and Suggestions for Future Research 82

Appendix A: INFORMED CONSENT 87

Appendix B: 동 의 서 89

Appendix C: Self-Regulation Questionnaire-Academic (SRQ-A) 91

Appendix D: Self-Regulation Questionnaire- Academic (SRQ-A) (Korean Version) 94

Appendix E: Perceptions of Parents Scales (POPS) 99

Appendix F: Perceptions of Parents Scales (POPS) (Korean Version) 103

Appendix G: Self-Report of Classroom Achievement in English Questionnaire 107

Appendix H: Self-Report of Classroom Achievement in English Questionnaire (Korean Version) 108

References 109

Vita… 123

List of Tables

Table 1-1: Three Views of Motivation (Brown, 2000, p. 162) 5

Table 1-2: Intrinsic - Extrinsic Continuum 9

Table 2-1: Sources of Motivation (van Lier, 1999, p. 105) 30

Table 3-1: Examples of Reasons Defining External, Introjected, Identified, and Intrinsic Categories (Adapted from Ryan and Connell, 1989, p.752) 53

Table 4-1: Descriptive Statistics for SRQ-A 59

Table 4-2: Multivariate Tests 60

Table 4-3: Mauchly's Test of Sphericity 60

Table 4-4: Tests of Within-Subjects Effects 61

Table 4-5: Post-hoc Test 61

Table 4-6: Gender Differences in Motivation Pattern 62

Table 4-7: Descriptive Statistics for POPS 63

Table 4-8: Multivariate Tests 63

Table 4-9: Mauchly's Test of Sphericity 63

Table 4-10: Tests of Within-Subjects Effects 64

Table 4-11: Post-hoc Test 65

Table 4-12: Gender Differences in POPS 66

Table 4-13: Correlations among subscales of the POPS, SRQ-A, and Classroom Achievement 67

Table 4-14: Correlations among Time, Confidence (CON) and Classroom Achievement (ACH) 70

Table 4-15: Correlation between #33 and Classroom Achievement (ACH) 71

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

This is a study of foreign language classroom motivation in a collectivist-oriented setting, from a self-determination theory (SDT) perspective. It seeks to examine the motivational patterns of Korean middle school students studying English and how these patterns impact their classroom achievement. It also explores the connection between these students' perceptions of parental involvement and support to their autonomy and their classroom achievement. This study further seeks to make some commentary on the possibility that SDT has cross-cultural applicability in the second language learning classroom, based on the data collected on these Korean students and comparing it with similar studies done in western cultures, mainly the United States and Canada.

Based on its traditional Confucian heritage, Korea has developed as a collectivist-oriented society, and studies on motivation in the second language classroom from a SDT perspective in such a context are few. Previous studies using SDT have been done in western non-collectivist learning settings.

Since the 1920's, the concept of motivation has been a central concern of scholars in traditional psychology. There are good reasons for all this attention, as the study of motivation is no less than an attempt to understand basic human behavior or why people decide to take action or engage in particular activities. The issue of motivation is an essential part of our everyday lives, and few would overlook the important role it plays in human affairs in general, and in education and language learning in particular (Dörnyei, 2001).

Despite this basic intuitive familiarity with the concept, psychologists differ on what motivation is, how the process of motivation operates, and what influences motivation (Pintrich and Schunk, 2002). The word "motivation" is derived from the

Latin verb *movere*, which suggests the idea of movement "as something that gets us going, keeps us moving, and helps us to complete tasks" (p. 5). As Ryan and Deci (2000) further describe it, "to be motivated means *to be moved* to do something. A person who feels no impetus or inspiration to act is thus characterized as unmotivated, whereas someone who is energized or activated toward an end is considered motivated" (p. 54). Brophy describes motivation as "a theoretical concept used to explain the initiation, direction, intensity, and persistence of behavior, especially goal-directed behavior" (Brophy, 1999, p. 2). Pintrich has a very similar definition of motivation as "the process whereby goal-directed activity is instigated and sustained" (Pintrich and Schunk, 2002, p. 5). For Dörnyei, a psychologist who focuses on language learning, a comprehensive explanation for the term "motivation" remains complex and elusive but he contends that most researchers would agree that motivation is concerned with the following key components:

- *Why* people decide to do something
- *How long* they are willing to sustain the activity
- *How hard* they are going to pursue it (Dörnyei, 2001, p. 8)

Dörnyei further describes motivation as "the dynamically changing cumulative arousal in a person that initiates, directs, coordinates, amplifies, terminates, and evaluates the cognitive and motor processes whereby initial wishes and desires are selected, prioritized, operationalised and …carried out" (p. 9).

Another prominent researcher in the field of language classroom motivation, the Canadian social psychologist Robert Gardner, sees motivation as a kind of "energy centre" that involves effort, will or cognition, and enjoyment (Gardner, 1985). Gardner's socio-educational model of second language learning has been the primary research framework for scholars in this field since the l970's.

The following sections will briefly consider the concept of motivation as it developed within traditional psychology, educational psychology and, finally, its more recent applications within the field of second language learning.

THEORIES OF MOTIVATION WITHIN TRADITIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

Dörnyei succinctly summarizes the main challenges that have faced motivational researchers in trying to reach a consensus within psychology over the past several decades. These are:

- Consciousness vs. unconsciousness, or to what extent can motivational behavior occur without reference to conscious thought
- Cognition vs. affect, or how can researchers develop a framework to explain these two influences on human behavior and motivation
- Reduction vs. comprehensiveness, or how can one control all the various ideas and concepts of motivation and balance them between these two influences to produce a viable model
- Parallel multiplicity, or how can one adequately account for and explain the interplay of varying goals and intentions on classroom motivation
- Context, or how to change the focus from an individualistic perspective to one that combines the notion that humans are social beings and sociocultural and contextual influences also play a vital role in forming motivational values
- Time, or recognizing that motivational activity and intensity has a temporal dimension and can fluctuate (Dörnyei, 2001)

Following the historical schools of thought within traditional psychology, research on motivation has generally been focused on three broad traditions, the behavioral, the cognitive, and the constructivist.

During the first half of the 20th century, behavioral theorists saw motivation as a response to changes in environmental events or stimuli, and acts were seen as a direct response to external forces in anticipation of a reward. Examples of these approaches were reinforcement, operant conditioning, and connectivist theories found in the writings of Skinner (1953), Thorndike (1932), and Watson (1924). These theories described humans as only responsive to basic drives and needs, and "motivation was conceptualized as drive created by deprivation of tissue needs (hunger, thirst, sex, etc.) and was operationalized using measures such as the number of hours since the last feeding" (Brophy, 1999, p. 2). Gradually this era of behaviorist theory gave way, starting in the late l950's, to the period of cognitive theory.

Cognitive theorists emphasized the role of individual mental processes and personal beliefs, thoughts, and emotions. Individual choices became the focus as to what task or goal would be attempted or avoided, and the amount of effort that would be exerted to attain a particular goal. For some of these theorists, individual needs or drives were the compelling force behind motivational decisions. For example, Ausubel (l968) suggested some of these needs driving human motivation to be the need for exploration, manipulation, activity, stimulation, knowledge, and ego enhancement. The main difference between the behaviorist and cognitive approaches lay in the depiction of the learner as organic rather than purely mechanistic. Cognitive theories include expectancy-value theory (Eccles and Wigfield, 1995), goal theory (Ames, 1992), attribution theory (Weiner, 1992), and self-efficacy theory (Bandura, 1993).

Social constructivist theory, which has become prevalent within the last 25 years, introduced the concept of the importance of social context along with individual choices in motivation. Motivational behavior occurs within a social milieu and cannot be separated from it (Brown, 2000). One of the most compelling of these constructivist theories is self-determination theory (SDT) (Deci and Ryan, 1985), which forms the theoretical basis for this study.

The language educator, Douglas Brown, summarizes the three approaches to motivation within traditional psychology as shown below in Table 1.1.

Table 1-1: Three Views of Motivation (Brown, 2000, p. 162)

Behavioristic	**Cognitive**	**Social Constructivist**
* anticipation of reward	* driven by basic human needs (exploration, manipulation, etc)	* social context
* desire to receive positive reinforcement	* degree of effort expended	* community
* external, individual forces in control	* internal, individual forces in control	* social status and * security of group
		* internal, interactive in control

A more recent development has been the emergence of another theoretical basis for understanding human motivation known as the sociocultural perspective. This approach, as initially enunciated by the Russian psychologist Vygotsky, has a strong connection and similarity with the constructivists, in that both perspectives are concerned with how learners construct meaning from everyday events. But the socioculturalist is also concerned with the social, cultural, and historical context into which every human is born and develops.

This sociocultural point of view of human development and learning makes clear that all learning is mediated by various tools and artifacts such as computers, art and music, with the most important mediation agent being language. These mediating artifacts are created by human culture and are then made available to succeeding generations who may or may not modify them before transferring them to future generations (Lantolf, 2000; Vygotsky, 1978). This emphasis upon the importance of context or culture in human learning is also of considerable relevance to this study, which seeks to understand the impact a collectivist setting or milieu may have upon educational motivation.

THEORIES OF MOTIVATION WITHIN EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

Traditional psychologists have been interested in motivation as it relates to human behavior in general, and tend to focus primarily on theoretical questions and the research methodologies necessary to explore such questions. Traditional psychology is interested in findings about personal traits or situational differences that allow researchers to make predictions about human behavior in specific situations (Brophy, 1999).

For educational psychologists, however, research on motivation tends to focus on motivation to learn in educational contexts, and research from this perspective is more attuned to applied questions or practical applications for the classroom. The primary interest of these researchers is in developing classroom strategies to maximize students' motivational patterns and this often requires different research methods from those used in psychology (Brophy, 1999). As Brophy goes on to say,

> this implies the need for scholarship on motivation in education to develop at least in part as a separate field of inquiry with its own unique questions and research methods, and not merely as an area of application for principles developed through scholarship on the psychology of motivation (p. 30).

Thus, while both researchers in traditional and educational psychology have struggled with the challenge of defining motivation, researchers in educational psychology have sought to develop a broad spectrum of theories to explain motivation in the classroom. These theories consist of both individualistic approaches and theories from social and contextual perspectives.

Some of the most promising of these approaches are:

1. Expectancy-value theory, which considers a person's expectancy of success for a given task and the value the person attaches to that task.
2. Attribution theory, in which individuals use past successes or failures where they might be dissuaded or encouraged to attempt future actions.
3. Self-efficacy theory, in which individuals make decisions about their behavior based on their belief about their own capabilities.
4. Goal theories, which consider goals to be the engine that promotes action and motivates students to act in a certain direction.
5. Self-determination theory, which is central to this present study, and which distinguishes motivation between an intrinsic or innate dimension, and extrinsic motivation that is regulation imposed externally.

The foregoing discussion has been a brief overview of some of the main aspects of the concept of motivation as viewed by scholars within educational psychology. The following section will consider how some of these ideas have been incorporated and adapted for use by researchers in the field of second language learning.

THEORIES OF MOTIVATION WITHIN SECOND LANGUAGE LEARNING

The disparity of approaches to understanding human motivation discussed above also carries over to the field of second language learning (SLL). However, despite this

apparent confusion, one central theme does stand out among SLL researchers, and that is the importance assigned to motivation in the learning of foreign or second languages.

The prominent applied linguist, Corder (1981), goes so far as to say that "given motivation, it is inevitable that a human being will learn a second language if he is exposed to the language data" (p. 8). For Stipek (2000), motivation is closely related to learning achievement, as the learning process itself requires a conscious and deliberate engagement in activities, and van Lier (1996) makes it clear that parents, teachers and experts all tend to agree that the right kind of motivation is the key to successful language classroom achievement. However, as van Lier goes on to point out, this unanimous agreement on the significance of motivation "does not absolve us from the need to find out what motivation really is, where it comes from, and how it does its job" (p. 98).

Perhaps the most consequential of the early researchers on motivation within SLL were Robert Gardner and Wallace Lambert in Canada (Gardner and Lambert, 1975). Their work, begun in the l960's, culminated in the socio-educational model of SLL in 1993, and the parameters of this model will be discussed further in a section of the Literature Review.

Other prominent theoreticians since that time have made equally important contributions to understanding SLL motivation, and these will also be further explored under Literature Review. But for the purposes of this study, the work of Deci and Ryan and the development of self-determination theory (SDT), with its central concepts of self-determination, internalization, and intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, are of primary concern as the basic theoretical framework supporting this project.

So, let us next look more closely at this theory which has been shown to have application in many different fields, such as business management, politics, sports and

medicine, and which has also been adapted in a most compelling way to the academic discipline of SLL.

SELF-DETERMINATION THEORY

This section will describe the theoretical framework for this study, self-determination theory (SDT), how it relates to other theories of SLL, and why I consider this approach to be useful in exploring educational motivation in the second language context.

Deci and Ryan and their colleagues at the University of Rochester set forth the principles of this theory, starting in the l970's, and their work has become known as the "Rochester School" on motivation in educational psychology (Pintrich and Schunk, 2002). Their book published in l985, *Intrinsic Motivation and Self-Determination in Human Behavior*, initially outlined the basic concepts of their theory.

In its basic form, human motivation can be seen to exist on a six-point continuum, from amotivation on the left, through four categories of extrinsic motivation, to intrinsic motivation on the right. The four categories of extrinsic motivation, external regulation, introjected regulation, identified regulation and integrated regulation, are listed in order of their degree of internalization and self-regulation, as shown in table 1.2 below.

Table 1-2: Intrinsic - Extrinsic Continuum

Amotivation	Extrinsic Motivation				Intrinsic Motivation
Non-regulation	External Regulation	Introjected Regulation	Identified Regulation	Integrated Regulation	Intrinsic Regulation
Non-internalized					Fully-internalized

Intrinsic motivation is defined as "the doing of an activity for its inherent satisfactions rather than for some separable reason. When intrinsically motivated, a person is moved to act for the fun or challenge entailed rather than because of external prods, pressures, or rewards" (Ryan and Deci, 2000, p. 56). Furthermore, intrinsic motivation is viewed as innate and universal and arises out of three basic psychological needs:

A need to strive for self-autonomy

A need to strive for competence

A need to strive for relatedness

Self-autonomy, also referred to as self-regulation or self-determination, is defined as the degree to which learners regard their activity as being self-initiated and not controlled by others (Ryan and Connell, 1989; Deci and Ryan, 2002). This perception of self-autonomy will provide greater value to the activity and enhance motivation to engage in it over the long term.

The need for competence involves being able to see oneself as fully capable to produce desired outcomes and, at the same time, to avoid negative results. The more competent learners perceive themselves to be, the greater will be the intrinsic motivation to pursue given tasks. Studies have shown that positive feedback given to students enhances perceived competence, and conversely negative feedback that implies incompetence results in a decrease in intrinsic motivation (Deci and Ryan, 1985). The need to strive for a feeling of relatedness relates to a feeling of being "securely connected to the social world and to see oneself as worthy of love and respect" (Jacobs and Eccles, 2000, p. 413).

Thus, intrinsic motivation is the most autonomous and self-determined form of behavior and is fully internal and integrated. However, even though the student may feel

autonomous, competent, and a sense of emotional connection to a given task, in some situations this intrinsic orientation, by itself, is not sufficient to drive motivation to act, and a sense of the value of such activity is also necessary (Jacobs and Eccles, 2000). As van Lier (1996) points out "most teachers and parents will attest to the prevalent view that children and students will not move with sufficient enthusiasm and alacrity towards the goals of exemplary citizenship and outstanding academic achievement, if guided by nothing more than intrinsic motivation" (p. 110).

Brophy (1999), too, makes clear that intrinsic motivation alone has some limitations in its application in the learning process and outlines some elements of caution. The first of these constraints is the emphasis placed on the enjoyment or pleasure factor in intrinsically-oriented learning, where this type of orientation is more suited to play or recreational activity rather than the hard tasks of classroom learning. Brophy goes on to say that classroom learning experiences can be rewarding in many ways, but they are generally not considered by most students as being fun in the same terms that video games and roller coaster rides are fun.

Therefore, Brophy suggests that teachers should deemphasize the "fun" component in intrinsically motivated learning, and that terms such as "meaningful, satisfying, or worthwhile are preferable to terms such as 'fun' for describing the process of intrinsically motivated learning" (p. 8). The second of these potential limitations is that the focus is often on learning what students are already interested in and find to be enjoyable. Teachers need also to be concerned with being change agents, developing students' interests in other domains of learning and not simply supporting their current interests. A third note of caution relates to the connection and potential conflict between the need for autonomy and the need for relatedness. Students may experience some difficulty and conflict in dealing with tasks they may wish to complete for the sake of

achieving autonomy and what they may feel compelled to do for purposes of satisfying their need for relatedness. Tasks assigned by teachers may be done for reasons relating to pleasing the teacher and not out of need for self-autonomy (Brophy, 1999).

It is quite evident that intrinsic reasons alone are not sufficient to provide the required motivation for classroom learning, and that externally-imposed regulation or extrinsic motivation has an important role to play in this process. As van Lier (1996) indicates "this means that there is a need for extrinsic motivation, in the form of such well-known educational tactics as tangible rewards, praise, coercion, punishment, and so on" (p. 110). The clear implication is that in order to transform basic intrinsic drives into motivational goals, especially in the classroom, the imposition of external regulation is necessary. In order to maximize this external impact on student motivation, teachers should strive to maximize student internalization at the identified or integrated level on the extrinsic continuum.

Thus, there is a need to combine and blend intrinsic and extrinsic motivation together for maximum impact in the classroom. Just relying on appealing to a student's intrinsic interests, as is common practice, will not be effective (Brophy, 1999). The next few paragraphs will address extrinsic motivation, its four distinct categories, and the important concepts of internalization and integration.

SDT consists of several mini-theories, and the most important of these theories is Organismic Integration Theory (OIT). OIT describes the important process of internalization and integration that takes place for the four different categories of extrinsically motivated behaviors, from the least self-determined or internalized external regulation through introjected regulation, identified regulation, and integrated regulation. Internalization refers to the process of embracing a value or regulation as one's own and

integration is the process by which a person accepts this internalized value as his or her own (Ryan and Deci, 2000).

The basic premise of OIT is that humans are naturally inclined toward internalization of experience, assuming they have the necessary encouragement to do so. Thus, internalization is a natural process where humans actively seek to transform extrinsic or external regulation into more internalized type of self-regulation. In Vygotskian terms (Lantolf and Appel, 1994; Moll, 1990; Vygotsky, 1978), this process represents a shift in focus from other-regulated activity to a more and more autonomous and self-regulated behavior on the part of learners. The implication is that as this process evolves, student motivation and learning will be enhanced. In using extrinsic types of motivational control, the role of the teacher should be to minimize such controls at the external and introjected levels and foster student adoption and internalization of these controls at the identified or integrated level.

Another of the mini-theories within SDT is referred to as Cognitive Evaluation Theory (CET). The focus of empirical investigation within CET has been on the impact of classroom and home environments in facilitating or preventing intrinsic motivation by sustaining or limiting the development of the three basic needs for self-autonomy, competence and relatedness in students. However, these influences only apply to those activities that are undertaken for the novelty, challenge or inherent interest or curiosity of students. To gain an appreciation and understanding of motivation for those activities that are not completed for these intrinsic reasons, we must consider the process of extrinsic motivation (Ryan and Deci, 2000).

The process of internalization of extrinsic motivation, described above under OIT, occurs across the four categories of extrinsic motivation as follows:

External Regulation – This is the least autonomous form of extrinsic motivation and includes being motivated by external reward or punishment as operant reinforcement. This form of operant conditioning can take the form of grades, monetary rewards, or even the threat of parental confrontation or a desire on the part of the student to be praised. Internalization, if it occurs, is unstable in nature and tends to disappear once external rewards or punishments are removed.

Introjected Regulation – This involves a degree of internalization of external regulation, but it is not integrated within the self. This type of extrinsic motivation is still quite controlling, as these behaviors are performed to avoid shame and guilt, or to attain feelings of esteem or self-worth. "This form of extrinsic motivation, although within the person (i.e. a controlling person does not physically have to be present), is not part of the integrated self, and can therefore not be considered to be self-determined, or to entail true choice" (van Lier, 1996, p. 111). This type of behavior is somewhat more stable in nature than external regulation, as it does not depend solely upon external rewards.

Identified Regulation – This is a more self-determined form of motivation as there is a conscious acceptance of the behavior as personally important. This identification with an action allows for higher degree of self-autonomy and a change in the locus of causality toward the self.

Integrated Regulation – This is the most self-determined form of extrinsic motivation. External regulation has been internalized and entirely integrated within the self and brought into congruence with needs and values that already become part of the self. Thus, this form of motivation shares many of the same qualities as intrinsic motivation, but it is still considered extrinsic as activities performed for this kind of motivation are driven by external regulation and not done for their inherent interest or enjoyment. For the purpose of this present study, the category of integrated regulation

will not be measured, as this particular form of highly integrated and internalized extrinsic motivation is not generally evident until an individual reaches adulthood (Deci, Vallerand, Pelletier, and Ryan, 1991), and therefore the middle school population used in this study is considered too young to have achieved this sense of integration.

Amotivation – This is the state wherein there is no incentive or motivation to engage in any activity at all on the part of the learner. "Students with this motivational style would be very unmotivated for school due to the low value, efficacy, and internal control they feel for school activities" (Brown, 2002, p. 262).

The process of internalization along the continuum described above is not necessarily developmental in nature. As Ryan indicates "one does not have to progress through each stage of internalization with respect to a particular regulation: indeed, one can initially adopt a new behavioral regulation at any point along this continuum depending upon prior experiences and situational factors" (Ryan and Deci, 2000, p. 63).

Deci and Ryan (1985) stress the distinct dichotomy between extrinsic and intrinsic forms of motivation. Despite the internalization and integration that may occur, even to the fully integrated level, externally-imposed regulation always maintains its extrinsic identity because it is not innate and is not done for simple pleasure or interest, and is externally imposed. My own view is that it is important to retain the distinction between the two, but as van Lier (1996) argues, one should consider the possibility that a dynamic positive relationship exists between them and that "this relationship is also the natural consequence of a Vygotskian view of learning in which innate and sociocultural forces go hand in hand" (p. 110).

Thus, intrinsic and extrinsic motivation may begin as disparate entities, but they may "converge and intertwine ever more closely, until it may well become impossible to tell one from the other most of the time" (van Lier, p.110). Thus, I would argue that,

even though the basic distinction proposed by Deci and Ryan that intrinsic needs for self-autonomy, competence and relatedness are innate and not socially formed, they can be socially modified by extrinsic motivations that are, in fact, socially formed. For example, there have been many studies showing that external rewards made in the classroom can have very negative effects on student intrinsic motivation to learn (Deci, 1971; Fisher, 1978; Kohn, 1993).

Finally, another comment is needed about the concept of relatedness and its relationship to extrinsic motivation that is of particular relevance to the present study. Students must normally be prompted to undertake externally-imposed or extrinsic tasks. The primary reason that they may perform these activities is that they are perceived to be of importance to their significant others, family, teachers, peer groups, or society in general, with whom they would like to maintain a close emotional connection. In a collectivist setting such as Korea, where activity tends to be done in support of group rather than individualistic goals, this point is of particular relevance and will be discussed more fully later.

The following paragraphs will briefly consider how SDT is related to two of the principal theories within SLL, and why I consider SDT to be more useful in exploring educational motivation than other motivational approaches. As discussed in the next section under Purpose of the Study, the main discussion on SLL motivation has centered on Gardner and Lambert's socio-educational model based on the concepts of instrumental and integrative motivation. The intrinsic-extrinsic distinction contained within SDT is similar to the instrumental/integrative dichotomy of Gardner's model, but is not identical. Both instrumental and integrative motivations are seen as types of extrinsic motivation as they are concerned with goals, subgoals, or objectives. An example of how they may interact is a learner who wants to master a language for the purpose of interacting with

the L2 community but who does not enjoy studying the language, and thus has only an extrinsic motivation (+integrative) (-intrinsic) (Oxford, 1999).

Another difference between these two approaches to understanding educational motivation is that Gardner identifies motivation only with long term goals, and does not consider here-and-now interest in the task or a student's natural curiosity and enjoyment in a language assignment (van Lier, 1996). For van Lier, Gardner's model is

> at one and the same time too narrow and too broad in its scope of application. It is too narrow, in that it ignores a range of phenomena relating to intrinsic motivation, and too broad, in that it insufficiently specifies potential components and contributing factors of motivation (p. 105).

Thus, I would argue that, because SDT and the concept of intrinsic motivation does pay attention to a student's present interests and concerns, as well as future more extrinsic goals, it represents a more comprehensive approach to understanding motivation in the classroom.

SDT can also be contrasted with another influential theory within SLL, Krashen's Monitor Model (Krashen, 1985). For van Lier (1996), Krashen's equating motivation with the notion of the affective filter is entirely too mechanistic, in that

> high motivation equates with a 'low affective filter', and a high affective filter equates with high anxiety. It would seem that in such an account high motivation would be equivalent to low anxiety, and vice versa. This means that related issues such as boredom, challenge, attention, and effort are neglected (p. 105).

SDT has also been found to be a parsimonious and consistent framework for explaining many different motivational orientations in a consistent manner, and accounting for learner differences in motivation (Noels, Pelletier, Clément, and Vallerand, 2003). Likewise, SDT has proved to be empirically testable, allowing for clear predictions in the application of the theory in the language classroom (Noels et al., 2003).

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

As indicated above, the general approach to understanding classroom motivation within SLL has some limitations and, because of its strong focus on individuals, may not be entirely appropriate for understanding language classroom motivation in a more collectivistic situation, where group goals and values are more the norm.

As further indicated above, it is my view that motivational theories within SLL, at least in the case of the two most influential ones of Gardner and Krashen, tend to provide a less than comprehensive view of motivation in the classroom, especially as it may relate to such a collectivist-oriented context.

The purpose of this study is to suggest that SDT, and its principal concepts of intrinsic/extrinsic motivation and the internalization continuum, may provide a more all-inclusive framework for understanding educational motivation for language learning in the Korean context. This study also investigates the notion of the universality of SDT, as it compares the motivational patterns of Korean schoolchildren with their counterparts in North American settings.

As previously indicated, Korean students tend to display apparent high levels of motivation to learn, and this high motivation seems to be influenced by strong parental support. Thus, another objective of this study is to determine if SDT can provide some insight on these Korean students' high motivation and parental support by measuring three factors from a SDT perspective:

1. The motivational patterns of these students in an EFL classroom setting.
2. These students' perception of parental influence on their learning.
3. The relationship of motivational patterns and parental influence to classroom achievement.

Many studies have demonstrated the value of SDT in understanding educational motivation in individualistic-oriented settings and exploring the relationship between various motivational types and classroom achievement (Grolnick and Ryan, 1987; Harter and Connell, 1984; Vallerand, Blais, Brière, and Pelletier, 1989). These studies have tended to show that the more self-determined forms of motivation are related to more positive classroom outcomes. As will be mentioned in the Literature Review (Chapter 2), there have been very few studies done in collectivist-oriented settings, and none that I am aware of in Korea. Thus, it is also hoped that this study may make a contribution to the base of knowledge regarding classroom motivation in general and to such behavior in more collectivist educational environments in particular. Further, I am interested in what may be academic implications for the classroom and contributions to the field of SLL overall.

To summarize, this study intends to examine the classroom motivational patterns and perceptions of parental support of a population of Korean middle school students studying EFL, and to determine how these factors may be related to their self-report of classroom achievement. By examining these issues from a SDT perspective, it is hoped that a more generalized understanding of classroom motivation in a collectivist context may result, and we may also gain a greater appreciation for the motivation of these Korean students, in particular. Related to these goals is the question of the universality of SDT. Can the findings from this study lead to any definitive conclusions about the cross-cultural applicability of SDT in the educational domain? Lastly, I hope to address what pedagogic implications may accrue as a result of this investigation, and what, if any, is its contribution to SLL overall.

To achieve these purposes, the following research questions were addressed:

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

There were five research questions investigated:

1. What is the motivational pattern of Korean middle school students learning English as a foreign language, from a SDT perspective, as measured by the Self-Regulation Questionnaire-Academic (SRQ-A)?
2. What is the correlation between the results of SRQ-A and these students' self-report of classroom achievement in English?
3. How do these students perceive their parental involvement and support for their autonomy, as measured by the Perceptions of Parents Scales (POPS)?
4. What is the correlation between the results of POPS and these students' self-report of classroom achievement in English?
5. What are the correlations among the scales and subscales of the SRQ-A and the POPS?

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

There is much anecdotal and empirical evidence to suggest that the people of Korea, and indeed of all East Asia, have a particularly high enthusiasm for education (Weidman and Park, 2000; Lett, 1998; Seth, 2002). This eagerness for learning on the part of Koreans has been described as "education fever" and even a "national obsession," with elementary, middle, and high school students spending extra study time each evening and on weekends at various types of cram schools (Seth, 2002).

A recent poll indicates that over 93 % of all Korean parents plan to have their children attend a university or college. The reality is that out of over 800,000 applicants, only approximately 300,000 can gain admittance to university. This creates a highly competitive situation and is a further indication of Korean peoples' extreme ambition to

attain higher education (Lett, 1998). The desire to learn English is an extension of this overall zeal for education and academic achievement.

Most of the previous research using SDT has been conducted in western, individualist-oriented settings, and only a very few studies have addressed its relevance for collectivist-oriented contexts (Hayamizu, 1997; Lynn, 1998; Yamauchi and Tanaka, 1998). Some researchers doubt that such a theory, developed upon purely individualistic values, can readily transfer to provide an understanding of motivation in societies with a more collectivist orientation (Watkins and Biggs, 1996).

Studies done in the west have tended to concentrate on an individualized sense of self and on a student's intrinsic reasons for classroom behavior, and encouraged teachers to develop students' natural interests and curiosities or focused on developing intrinsic motivation. Further, studies from this perspective have shown some degree of conflict between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, that the use of external rewards can have a negative effect on intrinsic motivation (Deci, 1971), and that external or extrinsic regulation should be minimized in the classroom as much as possible.

Also, inspite of the predominance of research done in the United States and its reporting confined to western journals and textbooks, there has been a strong tendency among western psychologists to accept the results of this research as universal. However, as Brophy points out, many of these "notions that we have taken as universal are in fact specific to the context of western culture. Included here are certain ideas that are basic to theory and research on motivation" (Brophy, 1999, p. 39). In western culture, individuals are treated as unique, and an essential key to development is movement toward an ever more "differentiated and individualized self-concept" (p. 39).

However, this idea of an individualized sense of self as being a basic foundation for understanding human motivation is not stressed in eastern cultures which are

characterized by a more collectivist orientation. People living in such cultures are socialized to think "more in terms of their memberships in families and other groups than their individual identities, of being part of an independent social network, and of pursuing agendas more as a member of a group than as an individual" (p. 39).

Collectivism and individualism are measured only in degree, and no particular culture is entirely one or the other. In a study by Hofstede (1980), countries highest on the scale of individualism included the United States, Australia, Great Britain, and Canada, and countries considered low in individualism, and thus highly collectively-oriented included Taiwan, Thailand, Hong Kong and Korea. Korea also is described as the country that, throughout history, embraced the principles of Confucianism more than any other, including China and Japan. Hofstede describes the difference between these two concepts as follows:

> Individualism pertains to societies in which the ties between individuals are loose; everyone is expected to look after himself or herself and his or her immediate family. Collectivism, as its opposite, pertains to societies in which people from birth onwards are integrated into strong, cohesive ingroups, which throughout people's lifetime continue to protect them in exchange for unquestioning loyalty (Hofstede, 1991, p. 51).

Triandis argues that the primary relationship between individualism and collectivism as it pertains to motivation and achievement relates to "(a) what is to be achieved, (b) by whom, and (c) for what purpose" (1995, p.1). Individualists will concentrate on the attainment of personal goals, by themselves, simply for pleasure, and self-regulation. Collectivists, on the other hand, will concentrate on the attainment of group goals, by and within the group, with the aim of promoting "group well-being, relationships, togetherness, the common good and collective utility" (p. 1).

Triandis (1995) also maintains that it is important to remember that all humans are collectivists to some extent. During our childhood years, we are interdependent, and

it is not until later years that we develop more self-regulation. However, "the difference among societies occurs because some ecologies, social conditions, histories, and other factors encourage this emancipation much more than others" (p. 3). I would suggest that in the case of Korea and other Confucian-heritage societies where Confucianism and collectivism are closely linked, this development of emancipation is somewhat less than in individualistic societies.

In conclusion, research on educational motivation in eastern cultures using SDT is extremely limited. So it is hoped that the present study will make some contribution to our understanding of how the concepts of SDT may operate in these collectivist-oriented contexts, particularly in English as a Foreign Language classrooms. In particular, I believe these types of studies in collectivist contexts may give rise to new perspectives on student motivation in language learning, dispel some of the stereotypes about learners in collectivistic settings and provide some additional insight for teachers and researchers in SLL.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

The review of literature contained in this chapter will cover Gardner's socio-educational model of second language learning, a review of studies conducted on the basic concepts of SDT, studies conducted on student motivation in second language learning using SDT, and those studies done in Asian and more collectivist-oriented contexts from a SDT perspective.

GARDNER'S SOCIO-EDUCATIONAL MODEL OF SECOND LANGUAGE MOTIVATION

As previously indicated, the most influential of the early studies on motivation and second language learning centered on the work of social psychologists in Canada, headed by Robert Gardner. It is not surprising that motivation research on second language learning is so robust in Canada as that country confronts a unique situation wherein two of the world's most primary languages, English and French, have official status. Accordingly, the Canadian government looks for ways to integrate these two different language-speaking communities in multicultural settings, and the result has been very generous financial support by the government of Canada for scholars in the field (Dörnyei, 2001).

Gardner and Lambert viewed second language as a primary force to mediate these two ethnolinguistic communities, and saw motivation to learn the language spoken by the other community as a tool to elevate communication through these two groups. In their view, major component of this approach is the person's attitudes toward the target language and its community, known as the integrative orientation. Another element is ethnocentric orientation and the very important role it plays in the development of a second language (L2) (Dörnyei, 2001). Gardner and his colleagues recognized that

affective variables, including "attitude, orientations, anxiety, and motivation, have been shown to be at least as important as language aptitude for predicting L2 achievement" (Noels et al., 2003, p. 35).

Gardner and Lambert initially introduced their instrumental / integrative model of motivation in the field of second language acquisition (SLA) in l959 (Gardner and Lambert, 1959). This theory later became known as the socio-educational model. It was the first real attempt to deal with SLA motivation and became the standard research tool and generated many studies until the 1990's, when it began to undergo some criticism.

The key concept of Gardner's theory was the relationship between motivation and a student's instrumental or integrative orientation. An instrumental orientation refers to the pragmatic gains of L2 proficiency, such as passing examinations, getting a good job, or receiving a higher salary. An integrative orientation refers to a desire on the part of the learner to interact with or be a part of the L2 community. An integrative orientation indicates that learners are willing to exert effort toward achieving those goals. Students who were integratively- oriented would demonstrate greater effort toward achieving their goals, including the achievement of superior L2 competence and proficiency. Thus, for Gardner, student classroom motivation was driven by three basic elements:

(a) intensity

(b) desire to learn the language and

(c) attitude toward the target language and the target people (Gardner, 1985)

Gardner's main idea was that the integrative orientation is positively related to L2 achievement and there is a direct cause and effect relationship. Gardner also developed the Attitude / Motivation Test Battery to measure student motivation, and it is still the only major published standardized test for L2 motivation.

Gardner's motivational model for second language learning was summarized in terms of the following five hypotheses:

- The integrative motive hypothesis: Integrative motivation is affirmatively related to the achievement of the second language.
- The cultural belief hypothesis: Cultural beliefs have influence on the development of the integrative motive and the degree to which integrativeness and achievement are relevant.
- The active learner hypothesis: Integratively motivated learners are successful because they are active in learning the target language.
- The causality hypothesis: Integrative motivation is a cause; second language achievement, the outcome.
- The two process hypothesis: Aptitude and integrative motivation should be considered separate factors in second language learning (Gardner, 1988).

In Gardner's model, integrative motivation is the central concept, but studies to demonstrate empirically its primary role in the achievement of the target language, within the social psychological research framework (Gardner, 1988; Gardner and Lambert, 1975; Gliksman, Gardner, and Smythe, 1982), have been inconsistent. Some early investigations did support the importance of an integrative orientation (Gardner and Lambert, 1959), but more recent research has suggested that the instrumental orientation resulted in equal or better achievement outcomes than integrative orientation, and in many cases the integrative orientation actually had a negative correlation with proficiency (Belmechri and Hummel, 1998; Dörnyei, 1990; Lukmani, 1972; Oller, Hudson, and Liu, 1977).

Dörnyei, for example, raised the question of whether motivation can be different between second language learners and foreign language learners, and further suggested that instrumental motivation could be more important than integrative motivation for foreign language learners. The reason for this is that foreign language learners, at least in the earlier stages of their language training, are likely not to have sufficient experience with target language speakers to have formed any opinion about integrating with them. As McClelland (1999) researcher points out, "this further leads to the connection that the motivational antecedents which emerge in FLL probably form clusters different to those emerging in second language learning" (p. 101).

Research conducted using Gardner's model as a framework have proven very useful in understanding language classroom motivation, and his ideas inspired a substantial body of research. However, beginning in the early 1990's, a number of criticisms were raised regarding his specific view of motivation and some of the hypotheses he proposed, and a call was issued for the development of new approaches to understanding language classroom motivation (Crookes and Schmidt, 1991; Dörnyei, 1990; Oxford, 1994; Oxford and Shearin, 1994).

While it is beyond the scope of the present discussion to examine all criticisms of Gardner's work in detail, it may be worthwhile to briefly discuss some comments generated by Au (1988), who looked at each of Gardner's five hypotheses.

With respect to the integrative motive hypothesis, which asserts that integrative motive is positively related to L2 achievement, Au postulated that it is problematic to generalize about this hypothesis due to the mixed results of studies done to verify it. As previously mentioned, some studies found the relationship between the integrative motive and L2 achievement to be positive, but other studies have found this relationship to be

negative. These studies also raised the question of how a less integratively motivated L2 learner could turn out to be a better learner in some contexts, and not in others.

Regarding the cultural belief hypothesis, which outlines the influence of cultural beliefs on (1) the development of the integrative motive and (2) the degree to which integrativeness and achievement are connected. Au stated that it is impossible to examine this hypothesis, as no clear definition has been made by Gardner and his colleagues about what constitutes a cultural belief.

The active learner hypothesis maintains that integratively motivated learners are successful because they are active in their language learning. Au argues that studies related to this hypothesis all "suffer from one serious methodological weakness. There is an obvious confounding variable – subjects' level of L2 proficiency" (p. 86), which was never controlled. She proposes the possibility of highly integratively motivated learners more actively participating in learning choices simply or primarily because they have better L2 proficiency.

According to the causality hypothesis, integrative motivation is a cause and second language achievement is the outcome. Using the results from three studies, Au suggests that there is no empirical evidence to support a causal link between the integrative motive and L2 achievement. One of these studies by Burstall, Jamieson, Cohen, and Hargreaves (1974) looked at a population of 5,700 primary school students in the United Kingdom, ages eight to eleven. This was a longitudinal study spanning ten years. These students were tested on their attitudes in learning French, and on their achievement in French at various stages during the ten-year period of the study. Comparing scores obtained during the early and later stages of the experiment, correlation analysis revealed that "early achievement in French affected later attitudes toward learning French and later achievement in French to a significantly greater extent

than early attitudes toward learning French affected the subsequent development of either attitudes or achievement" (p. 86).

The outcome of the Burstall et al.(1974) study suggested that there is no positive relationship between integration and achievement, but in fact a negative relationship between the two variables. Thus, in summation, successful second language learners may actually acquire positive motivation and attitudes toward learning the target language as a result of their positive achievement, in other words achievement drives motivation and not vice versa. Unsuccessful learners may acquire negative attitudes and motivational orientations.

With regard to Gardner's two process hypotheses, which hold that aptitude and integrative motivation should be considered separate factors in second language learning, Au again cites studies showing that a relationship between these two factors does exist and that integrative motivation appears to be more important in informal learning environments, and both factors are salient in formal learning settings.

Other more recent contributors have echoed some of the same disagreements with Gardner's scholarly work, as outlined by Au above. For example Schmidt, Boraie, and Kassabgy (1999) make note of Gardner's great emphasis on integrative motivation for language learning but note that it does not seem to fit in all language learning situations. With respect to the active learner hypothesis, if integratively motivated learners are successful because they are active in their language learning, then the same theory might be applicable to the instrumentally oriented learners, as they might also be very eager to succeed in language learning. These authors also mention that some studies question whether motivation is the cause or the outcome of successful language learning.

Crookes and Schmidt (1991) express an objection to Gardner's combining of affective factors and motivation, and thus making a clear definition of motivation itself, as a construct in learning, a difficult if not impossible task.

Van Lier (1996) discusses one other problem with the socio-educatioal model since it identifies motivation, and its components of instrumental and integrative orientation, only with long term and future goals, and does not take into account the here-and-now interest a student may have in the task. Nor does it consider a student's natural curiosity and enjoyment he/she may have in pursuing a particular goal. This distinction is shown in the following Table 2.1:

Table 2-1: Sources of Motivation (van Lier, 1999, p. 105)

Past	*Present*	*Future*
drives, needs	enjoyment of performance	goals in directing
learning, or other	in the present;	action;
responses programmed	intrinsic motivation	instrumental,
in the individual	emergent motivation(=FLOW)	integrative

As this Table 2.1 indicates, intrinsic motivation is concerned with present tasks and instrumental and integrative orientations are solely concerned with the future. For van Lier, this represents a very clear distinction between the concepts of Gardner and Deci and Ryan.

Another criticism of Gardner's work was contained in an article by McClelland (1999), which considered the applicability of the socio-educational model to EFL learning motivation in Japan. McClelland argues that Gardner's emphasis on integration may seem logical for second language learning contexts "where identifiable groups of target language speakers exist in proximity with the learners. On the other hand, it is questionable for FLL contexts where learners do not usually have any such contact" (p. 101). Thus, learners, in an EFL setting where contact with foreigners is limited, would have little or no commitment about integrating with them, and Gardner's model would have limited applicability. McClelland suggests that it is more useful to consider that there are many more variables which contribute toward EFL motivation, including instrumental orientation, knowledge orientation, travel orientation, a wish to make friends with foreigners, identification or a wish to be like native speakers, socio-cultural or an interest in foreign culture, and English media orientation.

Gardner himself has fully supported efforts to expand on and clarify his theory of motivation. In fact, in Tremblay and Gardner (1994), and in response to the critiques of Dörnyei, Oxford and Shearin, and Crookes and Schmidt, Gardner proposed a revised version of his socio-educational model to take into account some other motivational constructs from expectancy-value and goal theories, and suggested a language attidudes – motivational behavior – achievement order of progression.

This revised version of the model included several variables which mediate between learner attitudes and learner motivational behavior. These variables were goal salience, valence, and self efficacy. Gardner further indicates that in the socio-educational model of second language learning, the construct of "integrative motivation is seen as important. It is not seen as paramount, however. The central concept in the model is motivation" (p. 361). Gardner was eager to dispel the notion that his model of

second language learning is best understood by integrative and instrumental orientations alone. His position is rather "that motivation is best explained as a complex and dynamic process with room for several intervening variables (p. 366), and finally, Gardner supports the continued exploration of other motivational concepts and ideas. However, while Gardner mentioned in passing the concepts of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, he does not include them in his modified model or make any other mention of SDT at all.

As a further response to these criticisms, the socio-educational model was again updated by Tremblay and Gardner (1995) to show that second language classroom motivation theory should consist of four distinct components:

- The concept of the *integrative motive*
- A basic learning model, identified as the *socio-educational model*, that integrates motivation as its fundamental premise
- The *Attitude / Motivation Test Battery (AMTB)*, which provides a variety of influential motivational elements for classroom learning and is also often used as standardized instrument, with well-structured psychometric components
- An *expanded and revised L2 motivation construct*, which proposes a simple relationship between language attitudes, motivational behavior and achievement, with the addition of three mediating variables of goal salience, valence, and self-efficacy

Despite these disagreements and uncertainties about certain concepts contained within Gardner's socio-educational model of language classroom motivation, these criticisms were made in a positive and constructive manner. As Dörnyei (1994) indicates, these questions were not in any way an attempt to contradict the social

psychological approach, but "were compatible with it in a complimentary sense" (p. 521) and were put forth in the hope of building upon and further developing Gardner's ideas.

Dörnyei (1994) sees the necessity to bring about consolidation and integration of all these additional ideas with Gardner's theory in order to be able to answer such questions as "where should we place 'instrumental orientation'? Would it be outside the construct, affecting only the 'motivation' component? What about other orientations identified in the literature (e.g. knowledge, travel) or components like 'self-confidence', 'need for achievement', or 'parental support'?" (p. 522)

Despite her reservations with Gardner's ideas, Oxford (1994) also continued to uphold the basic thrust of Gardner's theory by saying that "I do not want us to forget the social psychological perspective; instead I would like for us to build upon that perspective and tap other relevant perspectives as well" (p. 513). Oxford further claimed that a positive outcome of all these criticisms might be to inspire and

> encourage all language learning researchers – including the new generation – to look at motivation in greater detail, with keener vision, with a wider theoretical perspective, and with more urgency. We are at a key point in time regarding research on language learning motivation. Gardner and his colleagues originally brought us to the place we are. For this we can be grateful, no matter where we go from here (p. 514).

So, as far as Oxford was concerned, these new approaches were not meant to replace Gardner's ideas involving the instrumental-integrative distinction, but rather to complement them and expand upon them.

SELF-DETERMINATION THEORY AND SECOND LANGUAGE MOTIVATION

As previously discussed, many new theoretical approaches to understanding second language classroom motivation were initiated in the 1990's, after the challenge was established by Oxford (1994), Dörnyei (1994), and Crookes and Schmidt (1991).

Several of these new avenues to understanding educational motivation are outlined in Chapter 1 of this paper, and Oxford (1996) refers to them as "pathways to the new century" in understanding language learning motivation. However, for the purposes of this present study, our concentration will focus upon the ideas of Deci and Ryan (1985), known collectively as self-determination theory (SDT), and the literature and studies associated with this framework.

Studies on Basic Concepts of SDT Theory

The basic concepts of the theory, outlined previously in Chapter 1, will not be repeated here. Even though SDT was not initially proposed as a means to gain insight into motivation in second language learning, it has been adapted and embraced by scholars in this field (Dörnyei, 1994, 1998, 2001; Dörnyei and Schmidt 2001; Noels et al. 1999, 2001; Vallerand et al., 1992, Vallerand, 1997; Williams and Burden, 1997). SDT is also prominently mentioned in textbooks and works by authors writing on the subject of educational motivation in general, such as Brown (2000, 2002), Brophy (1999), Pintrich and Schunk (2002), Stipek (2002), and van Lier (1996).

A review of the literature associated with SDT itself must start with the seminal works by Deci (1975) and Deci and Ryan (1985), in which they outlined the various types of extrinsic motivation, and described the concepts of intrinsic motivation and amotivation. Deci and Ryan (1985) also presented their idea of the three basic underlying psychological needs which drive motivation, a striving for self-autonomy, competence, and relatedness.

Ryan and Deci (2000) described more fully several mini-theories within SDT, perhaps the most important of which for purposes of this study were called Organismic Integration Theory (OIT) and Cognitive Evaluation Theory (CET). OIT described the

process of internalization which takes place within the four different categories of extrinsically motivated behaviors as individuals seek to attain greater self-regulation and autonomy, as also described in Chapter 1.

As Vallerand (1997) reports, SDT has been the subject of over 800 studies to that date. Many of these individual studies have been focused on CET.

CET is concerned with the effects of extrinsic rewards on intrinsic motivation, and there have been many studies done since the l970's to demonstrate this effect in the educational domain. Some of these studies will be discussed below. Deci (1975) suggested that CET consists of three propositions:

(1) One process by which intrinsic motivation can be affected is a change in perceived locus of causality from internal to external. This will cause a decrease in intrinsic motivation when someone receives extrinsic rewards for engaging in intrinsically motivated activities (p. 139).

(2) The second process by which intrinsic motivation can be affected is a change in feelings of competence and self-determination. If a person's feelings of competence and self-determination are enhanced, his intrinsic motivation will increase (p. 141).

(3) Every reward (including feedback) has two aspects, a controlling aspect and an informational aspect. If the controlling aspect is more salient, it will intitiate the change in perceived locus of causality process. If the informational aspect is more salient, the change in feelings of competence and self-determination process will be intitated (p. 142).

The first proposition implies that extrinsic rewards do have more impact than intrinsic rewards, and that if an individual perceives that the locus of causality for an action is external they will behave accordingly. Thus, if the perception is that they

engage in a certain behavior for an extrinsic reward, "then they'll do so only when they think such activity will lead to the extrinsic reward: (p. 139).

The second proposition suggests that some rewards or feedback will either increase or decrease intrinsic motivation, depending on whether they are considered enhancing or diminishing to a person's competence and self-determination.

The third proposition implies that extrinsic rewards can be perceived as either controlling or informational. Controlling rewards will initiate the change in locus of causality process, and if the reward is perceived as informational, changes in feelings of competence and self-regulation will be initiated.

Rogers (1985) discusses some implications for teachers stemming from these three propositions of CET. She suggests that positive feedback should be seen by the students as informational. If praise is perceived by the students as being manipulative, the controlling aspect will become salient and result in a decrease in motivation. For Rogers, "grades, certificates, stars, stickers, etc. should be downplayed as ends in themselves" (p. 259). When giving grades, teachers should explain that the grade only represents a shortcut to make for easier record-keeping. The emphasis on the informational aspect of feedback would need to continue throughout the student's school career. Teachers should also not appear to be too controlling in the classroom, and let the students know that such control is only for reasons of "discipline, safety, administrative responsibilities, and to observe students in the process of learning" (p. 260).

Another study, Pritchard, Campbell, and Campbell (1977), examined the impact of extrinsic financial reward contingent on performance and also found that it decreases intrinsic motivation. After observing the amount of time students spent on resolving a chess problem in a free period, one group was offered financial reward for working on the solution and the other group was not. A week later, these students were again

observed as they worked on the task on a free period with no financial incentive. Findings supported the hypothesis that external reward did result in a decrease in intrinsic motivation.

Yet another study to demonstrate the effect of extrinsic reward on intrinsic behavior involved 37 children drawing with felt markers. These children were divided into three groups, those who expected and received a reward, those who engaged in the activity without expectation of reward but did receive an award upon completion, and those students who neither expected nor received an award. Results of this study showed that students who expected and received an award for engaging in the drawing activity demonstrated significantly less subsequent interest in the task than did students who had engaged in the drawing activity without expectation of a reward, or the students in the no award group. Furthermore, "although the children expecting a reward tended to draw more pictures during the experimental sessions than children not expecting a reward, these pictures were judged significantly lower in overall quality" (Greene and Lepper, 1974, p. 1144). The authors of this study also point out that even changing the performance demand on these students had no particular effect on the observed changes in motivation, "suggesting that the deleterious effects of expected rewards on subsequent intrinsic interest are not limited to a particular manner of presentation of the reward" (p. 1141). For Greene and Lepper this shows that simply presenting the drawing activity "as a means to a salient ulterior goal can be sufficient to produce a decrease in later intrinsic interest in that activity" (p. 1141).

McDonald (1982) reported on a study of 42 high school students who worked on puzzles involving solutions to mazes and anagrams. These students were divided into four separate groups; one group had competence in the task made salient by verbal praise, in a second group verbal praise was used to recognize the obligatory nature of the task, in

a third group financial rewards were given out for above average performance, and students in the fourth group were paid $1.00 for helping out with the experiment. Results of the study showed that those students who received verbal praise for their competence reported significantly higher task interest than those in the other groups. Verbal praise for competence was highly effective in sustaining intrinsic interest in the task.

From the above review of the literature, it is readily apparent that many studies have been done to confirm the hypothesis contained within CET that extrinsic rewards, unless carefully exercised, can have a detrimental effect on intrinsic interest in the classroom.

SDT studies have been applied to many different domains, including medicine, politics, sports, human well-being, music and education. One other cross-cultural educational study, not previously mentioned, examined the role of autonomy and competence in two German and two American university settings, and these were found to be different in terms of their relative emphasis on competence versus autonomy. German students felt significantly more autonomous and less competent than American students, and this had a negative impact on their well-being (Levesque, Stanek, Zuehlke, and Ryan, 2004).

A study done in the political domain, using the principles of SDT as outlined in Chapter 1 starting at page 9, examined intrinsic and identified motivation in the context of two Canadian political campaigns. It was found that identified regulation and not intrinsic regulation was predictive of greater positive behavior (i.e. voting) (Losier and Koestner, 1999), which is a very similar result to studies done in the educational domain. This kind of finding would tend to indicate that the principles of SDT may also apply across domains as well as cross-culturally.

Two other studies of particular relevance to this present research also showed that identified regulation was more important than student intrinsic interest in predicting positive outcomes in the classroom. In one case involving a science class, SDT was used to measure student motivation levels and showed that a student who was motivated to learn science but had no basic intrinsic interest in science consistently pursued learning goals when engaged in science classroom activities. However, a student who was not motivated to learn science, but has an intrinsic interest in science, only pursued learning goals when they were considered fun (Lee and Brophy, 1996).

Another study showed that identified regulation was more important than intrinsic motivation in shaping student adaptation to life after graduation. It was clear that it was not enough for these students to regard schoolwork as enjoyable but they also needed to consider it personally consistent with their own values (Koestner, Losier, Fichman, and Mallet, 1998).

Despite these many studies on the negative effect of some extrinsic rewards on intrinsic motivation, this issue is not without controversy, "particularly for operant theorists, who wholly deny that contingent rewards could reap such negative effects" (Ryan and La Guardia, 1999, p. 51).

Brown (2000) states that measuring the extent of a learner's intrinsic or extrinsic motivation to achieve is "arguably the most powerful dimension of the whole motivation construct in general" (p. 164), and that the intrinsic-extrinsic continuum is of universal relevance and can be used to understand motivation in classrooms around the world.

For Brophy (1999), SDT represents the most compelling and productive line of work yet presented to describe intrinsic motivation in the classroom, even though "much of the theory and research on intrinsic motivation has lacked a focus on motivation to learn" (p. 41). But Brophy also decries the emphasis placed on enhancing intrinsic

motivation in the classroom, and suggests that some element of external or extrinsic regulation at the identified or integrated level is also necessary to maximize learning motivation. Brophy's position is that teachers should not consider intrinsic motivation as the ideal motivational state to be engendered in the classroom and this should not be the ultimate goal for teachers.

Van Lier (1996) also takes the position that too much emphasis is placed on the intrinsic end of the continuum, at least in studies conducted in western contexts, and this may be a reflection of the individualistic orientation of these settings.

Studies of Second Language Learning from a SDT Perspective

We will now turn our attention to the work of authors who have adapted the principles of SDT to second language learning. It is perhaps not surprising that many of these authors are also Canadian (Noels, Clément, Pelletier, Vallerand), following in the scholarly footsteps of Robert Gardner.

The strong connection between the SDT concept of learner autonomy or self-determination and success in second language learning has been a focus of considerable research interest (Benson, 2001; Dickinson, 1995; Ehrman and Dornyei, 1998). Benson (2001), although not actually an SDT theorist per se, makes a strong case for student autonomy as a critical precondition for successful learning of languages, because as learners become more autonomous "they not only become better language learners but they also develop into more responsible and critical members of the communities in which they live" (p. 1). Benson defines autonomy as the capability to take control over one's learning, and he makes three general claims for the concept:

- The concept of autonomy is grounded in a natural tendency for learners to take control over their learning. As such, autonomy is

available to all, although it is displayed in different ways and to different degrees according to the unique characteristics of each learner and each learning situation.

- Learners who lack autonomy are capable of developing it given appropriate conditions and preparation. The conditions for the development of autonomy include the opportunity to exercise control over learning. The way in which we organize the practice of teaching and learning therefore have an important influence on the development of autonomy among our learners.
- Autonomous learning is more effective than non-autonomous learning. In other words, the development of autonomy implies better language learning (p. 2).

Student self-regulation consists of setting goals, paying attention to classroom instruction, establishing effective learning strategies, maintaining a productive work environment, effective use of resources, monitoring performance, time management, holding positive attitudes about self-efficacy and the value of learning, and experiencing a sense of satisfaction and accomplishment with one's efforts (Schunk and Zimmerman, 1998).

These views of student autonomy closely reflect that of Deci and Ryan (1985) and their view of intrinsic motivation, with learner autonomy as one of its basic, universal and innate components.

For van Lier (1996), learning has to be initiated and completed by the learner. Therefore, "teaching cannot cause or force learning, at best it can *encourage* and *guide* learning. The impetus for learning must come from the learner, who must *want* to learn, either because of a natural human propensity to do so, or because of an interest in the

material" (p. 12). The self-regulated learner must make the important decisions about what, how and where learning is to take place. This is also similar to the viewpoint of Deci and Ryan.

Vallerand and his colleagues have been perhaps the most prolific in publishing in this area. I have counted a total of at least 16 articles attributed to them within the past two decades. Vallerand et al. (1992), developed a scale to measure classroom motivation based specifically on the tenets of SDT, and this scale was referred to as the Academic Motivation Scale. He also posited that intrinsic motivation consisted of three distinct types: (1) motivation to know – the performance of an activity for just the pleasure and the satisfaction of the learning experience; (2) motivation to accomplish something – similar to the concept of the desire for mastery; and (3) motivation to experience stimulation. These types are very similar to Deci and Ryan's concept of intrinsic motivation as consisting for the need for autonomy, competence, and relatedness.

Vallerand and Ratelle (2002) presented a Hierarchical Model of Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation which included several of the elements of SDT. This model suggests that intrinsic, extrinsic motivation, and amotivation exist on three levels of generality; the global, contextual, and situational. At the global level an individual has developed a motivational orientation which interacts with the environment in an extrinsic, intrinsic or amotivational types. Motivation at this level is considered to be the most stable. Motivation at the contextual level refers to activity within either the educational, leisure, and interpersonal spheres. This type of motivation is considered to be moderately stable and can be affected by social factors specific to each setting. Motivation at the situational level is concerned with studying why individuals engage in particular activities at a particular time, and motivation at this level is considered to unstable because of its ready susceptibility to changes from the social milieu. Appropriate scales

for measuring these three distinct types of motivation were also presented. The intention of the authors was to present a "model which provides a conceptual framework for organizing and understanding the core mechanisms underlying intrinsic and extrinsic motivational processes" (p. 48). A second intention was to provide a model from which "we can derive new and testable hypotheses" (p.48). From a pedagogical standpoint, the goal was to provide a framework to understand motivation from a multidimensional perspective.

The approach mentioned above by Vallerand and his colleagues (Vallerand, 1997; Vallerand, Blais, Brière, and Pelletier, 1989), suggested a three-part taxonomy of intrinsic motivation. These three types of intrinsic motivation are as follows:

(1) Knowledge, or the motivation for engaging in an activity for the purpose of exploring new ideas and pursuing knowledge.

(2) Accomplishment, or the feelings associated with mastery or achievement of a goal.

(3) Stimulation, or motivation that is based simply on the feelings associated with performing a task for aesthetic reasons or for fun and excitement.

Perhaps the most unambiguous adaptation of SDT for second language learning contexts has been by Noels et al., (1999, 2001, 2003) in Canada. Noels et al., (2003), describe the development of a new instrument to assess the different subtypes of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. They also investigate the link of these subtypes to other variables, such as Gardner's instrumental and integrative orientations. Noels also investigates the relationship between the motivational subtypes of SDT and other variables such as interest in travel, friendship, knowledge and Gardner's concept of instrumental orientation. Their findings suggest that "the instrumental orientation and the SDT external regulation orientation were strongly correlated, and that the travel,

friendship, and knowledge orientations were quite highly intercorrelated with identified regulation and intrinsic motivation" (p. 34).

Other findings of their study suggested that learner motivation can be assessed using the Deci and Ryan intrinsic-extrinsic continuum, and that it is possible to distinguish between amotivation and the other subtypes. Also, identified regulation has a stronger relation to the criterion variables than does intrinsic motivation. On a practical level, Noels suggests that those who may enjoy learning an L2 "may not necessarily feel personally involved in the learning process; they may view language learning as a puzzle or a language game that has few repercussions in everyday life" (p. 52). Thus, it may be necessary to persuade students that besides being interesting and enjoyable, language learning is also personally of great importance to them. It was also clear that the more the learners "perceived their teachers as controlling and as failing to provide instructive feedback, the less they were intrinsically motivated" (p. 53), which is consistent with SDT.

Noels et al. (2003) further suggested that it was necessary to replicate studies such as this in other sociocultural contexts and cultures. Specifically, they indicated a need to test the relevance of concepts of intrinsic motivation based on research conducted in the west, with other cultural settings where children may be "more intrinsically motivated when choices were made for them by trusted authority figures" (p. 55). For Noels et al., studies to test the universality of the principles of SDT should be a salient research goal. With this recommendation in mind, the next section of this literature review will address this issue of the application of the principles and concepts of SDT to a non-western, more collectivist-oriented educational environment.

In another study, Noels et al., sought to investigate the relationship between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation and Gardner's intergrative orientation, also to replicate

previous research into the motivational patterns of French-Canadian students learning English (Noels, Clèment, and Pelletier, 2001), and what the implications might be for language learning outcomes. This was a study of 59 French-Canadian students learning English in a summer immersion course. The survey instruments used were based on scales developed by Noels. Again, in this study extrinsic regulation at the identified level was the most strongly endorsed reason for studying English, followed by external regulation and integrative orientation. As to the relationship between Gardner's integrative concept and instrinsic and extrinsic motivation, the integrative orientation correlated most highly with intrinsic motivation and identified regulation, somewhat with introjection, and not at all with external regulation or amotivation. Noels concluded that "of all the orientation sub-types, the integrative orientation is most similar to the intrinsic orientation" (p. 432).

As Noels et al. (2003) point out, this finding is not consistent with the suggestion of Gardner (1985) that integrative orientation is most similar with extrinsic rather than intrinsic motivation. This is also the position of other scholars in the field (van Lier, 1996), and is also the position to which I would subscribe to for the reason that integrative orientation is concerned with future goals and not for the here-and-now task. Thus, by definition, the integrative orientation cannot be associated with intrinsic motivation. However, I could agree with Noels when she states that "the integrative orientation is aligned most closely with more self-determined forms of motivation" (p. 434), but this is the case only on the extrinsic level.

Studies Done in Asian Contexts from a SDT Perspective

There have been very few reports of studies done on the applicability of SDT to educational motivation in a non-western, and in particular, an Asian setting. I could find

none that have been done in the context of the Korean educational system. There have been several studies completed with respect to the situation in Japan and China. Some of these will be discussed in the following paragraphs.

A study done by Yamauchi and Tanaka (1998) in Japan examined relationships among autonomy, self-referenced beliefs, and self-regulated learning. In this study, 356 elementary school children (180 boys and 176 girls) were asked to answer two self-report questionnaires. The first questionnaire was to assess four types of motivation (external, introjected, identified, and intrinsic regulation). The second questionnaire assessed these children's beliefs for schoolwork, such as "self-esteem and perceived control, and also self-regulated learning such as values, goal orientations, and strategies" (p. 806).

Although this study done by Yamauchi and Tanaka (1998) does not relate SDT motivational types to classroom achievement, it does relate these motivational types to other classroom variables, such as learner beliefs and strategies used for learning. Results of this study show that as the motivational types change from external regulation to more self-determined types of motivation, scores on both identified and intrinsic regulations are positively correlated with student ratings of learning goals. The researchers further concluded "there was no unique characteristic of learning process for Japanese children. It could be considered that the results of this investigation were similar to the studies performed in Western countries" (p. 815).

Another study done in a collectivist-oriented setting, emphasizing the dichotomy between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation was conducted by Hayamizu (1997) in Japan. The primary purpose of the study was to design a scale to assess Deci and Ryan's four types of motivation for academic achievement and then to test its validity. The four types of motivation were external, introjected, identified, and intrinsic motivation. In this study, the Stepping Motivation Scale (SMS), developed by the researcher, was

administered to 483 junior high school students (239 boys and 244 girls). Hayamizu claimed that intercorrelations among the four subscales corresponded to a simplex structure, and verified a continuum from extrinsic to intrinsic motivation. In order to make clear the distinction among the four types of motivation, Hayamizu related motivation types to "relevant variables such as causal attributions and coping behaviors in failing situations, beliefs in links between extrinsic and intrinsic motivation, and teachers' evaluation of students' motivation" (p. 98).

Hayamizu (1997) maintained that he developed and tested the SMS based on the belief that intrinsic and extrinsic motivation was continuous rather than dichotomous. The hypothetical features were sustained based on a simplex structure of the intercorrelations among four types of motivation. According to Hayamizu, the test of four types of motivation relating to causal attribution and coping behaviors supported the belief that extrinsic and intrinsic motivation are not dichotomous or antagonistic, but continuous and complimentary and that, in fact, extrinsic reasons could be transformed into intrinsic reasons. My own view of his position is that SDT does not allow for such a transformation, as, by definition, intrinsic motivation is innate in the sense that it requires no process of internalization, and is also qualitatively distinct in that "important" does not shade into "fun, or interesting". Therefore extrinsic motivation cannot become intrinsic. Thus, I cannot agree with Hayamizu on this point. External regulation can become more *intrinsic-like* through the process of internalization, but can only go so far as the more self-determined, identified or integrated forms of extrinsic motivation and cannot ever be considered actually to transform itself into intrinsic motivation. Even though there is some dynamic and interchange between them in that external regulation can modify intrinsic motivation, by definition, the basic distinction remains and one cannot actually become the other.

Another author, Lynn (1988), also presents data on the intrinsic motivation of Japanese students, and the role of parents in the acquisition of intrinsic motivation. Again, he is suggesting that intrinsic motivation can be socially formed, which is not in accord with the basic definition of intrinsic motivation that it is innate. He cites several studies which indicate that Japanese children have high intrinsic motivation for academic work, but in another section of his book seems to contradict this by saying that "their intensive school work is not entirely a labor of love, and that a significant portion of their motivation is extrinsic, that is purely a function of the external incentives for work effort" (p. 65). But again, in this researcher's opinion, to refer to these Japanese childrens' motivation as intrinsic motivation is not correct. It is more accurate to say, or more in accordance with Deci and Ryan's terminologies, that this is an internalized form of extrinsic motivation, and this study and others indicate that motivation in the educational domain is primarily extrinsic at the integrated level, and students are not intrinsically motivated to learn. Lynn's statement that "Japanese children initially develop extrinsic motivation for academic work, but during the course of childhood this becomes internalized as intrinsic motivation" (p. 90), I would argue should be changed to reflect that in the beginning these children may have some intrinsic reasons for studying, but during the course of childhood, motivation to learn is propelled and made stronger by the internalization of extrinsic reasons at the identified level.

A very few other studies have been done using SDT in the Korean context (Chirkov, Ryan, Kim, and Kaplan, 2003), but not from an educational motivation perspective. The Chirkov study examined the connection between autonomy, the integration of cultural values and its effect on individual well-being in four cultures, one of them being Korea. Chirkov et al., found that despite the differences in the

internalization of cultural practices, the relative autonomy of individuals' motivation for their cultural practices predicts well-being for individuals in each culture.

Another recent article (Benson, Chik, and Lim, 2003) examines the socialization process involved in becoming autonomous in an Asian context. These authors make clear that researchers need to be careful to not accept *a priori* generalizations about the non-existence of student autonomy in collectivist Asian societies, and "to recognize the sense in which the development of autonomy forms part of the sociocultural process of second language learning for many Asian learners" (p.24).

Another article (Kim and Choi, 1994), also explores the concepts of individualism and autonomy and their development from a strictly Korean perspective and also documents the differences between the U.S. and Korea, but does not specifically address the topic of classroom or educational motivation. The purpose of this article was "to examine the cognitive socialization of children living in culturally continuous versus culturally discontinuous environments" (p. 253), but does not make any reference to SDT.

From the above discussion, it is quite evident that literature on Korean educational motivation from a SDT perspective is sparse.

In summary, it is clear from the literature that most scholars in the field consider SDT to be a useful tool for measuring and understanding human motivation across many domains, including the language learning classroom. Furthermore, it seems to have potential for applicability on a cross-cultural basis.

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

This investigation was in the nature of a survey study, which is defined as a description of the "characteristics/attitudes/opinions of a *population* by examining a subset of that group, the *sample*, at a single point in time" (Dornyei, 2001, p. 216).

A quantitative research method was used, consisting of three survey instruments. The first survey instrument is referred to as the Self-Regulation Questionnaire-Academic (SRQ-A), and the second instrument is known as the Perceptions of Parents Scales (POPS). Both of these scales have been developed for use by researchers in educational motivation interested in testing the principles outlined by SDT. A third questionnaire developed by me was entitled Self-Report of Classroom Achievement in English. These surveys were utilized to investigate the following five research questions:

1. What is the motivational pattern of Korean middle school students learning English as a foreign language, from a SDT perspective, as measured by the Self-Regulation Questionnaire-Academic (SRQ-A)? (See appendix C)
2. What is the correlation between the results of SRQ-A and these students' self-report of classroom achievement in English? (See appendices C & G)
3. How do these students perceive their parental involvement and support for their autonomy, as measured by the Perceptions of Parents Scales (POPS)? (See appendix E)
4. What is the correlation between the results of POPS and these students' self-reported classroom achievement in English? (See appendices E & G)
5. What are the correlations among scales and subscales of the SRQ-A and the POPS? (See appendices C and E)

SETTING AND PARTICIPANTS

This examination was conducted with a total of 167 Korean middle school students studying English as a foreign language (EFL) at two separate schools in Seoul, Korea. One school was a girls' school, and the other was a co-educational school. These students ranged in age from 13 to 16, consisting of 117 females and 50 males. The reason for the imbalance in gender was that I knew the teachers of the girls' school, and access was easier to girls than to the boys in the co-educational classes. For the girls, the survey instruments were explained and administered by me in the presence of the teacher. In the co-educational classes, only the boys were asked to participate in the surveys, and the teacher explained and administered the survey instruments. Both of the schools used in this survey were located in a middle class area in the southeast section of Seoul.

I obtained the necessary permission for access to these classes from the principals and teachers involved. Prior to beginning the collection of data, I obtained authorization from the Institutional Review Board of the University of Texas at Austin to conduct such a study involving human subjects, and then the appropriate consent forms for parents and/or students were completed.

Several unique problems were anticipated in this cross-cultural environment. In Korea, such surveys are generally not presented to the students as voluntary, and teachers require their completion as part of a routine classroom task. Thus, extra care was taken to make sure the teachers, students, and their parents completely understood the voluntary nature of this type of survey. This went beyond the normal confidentiality statement contained in the consent form, and required an additional oral instruction on this topic to the students by me prior to their completing the survey. Students were not required to put their names on their survey questionnaires. It was further emphasized to the students that, even though they may be asked to complete these surveys as part of normal

classroom routine, their participation was entirely voluntary. After collecting the survey sheets, I numbered the sheets for identification purposes.

Instructions and the survey itself were given in Korean, so translation had to be accurate and complete. This topic of translation is discussed further below.

RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS

Several research instruments for researching motivation using the principles of SDT have been developed (Hayamizu, 1997; Harter, 1981; Vallerand et al., 1992). As mentioned above, I chose to use the Self-Regulation Questionnaire-Academic (SRQ-A) (Ryan and Connell, 1989), and the Perceptions of Parents Scales (POPS) (Grolnick, Deci, and Ryan, 1991, 1997) as being the most appropriate for the particular population of students to be used in this study.

The survey questionnaire is considered one of the most appropriate and most common methods for collecting data in second language research. The survey technique is, in fact, only surpassed in the field of language learning by that of language proficiency tests (Dörnyei, 2003). Some of the reasons for this wide use of the survey are due to the fact that it is "easy to construct, extremely versatile, and uniquely capable of gathering a large amount of information quickly in a form that is readily processable" (p. 1).

One of the advantages to using a questionnaire which has had extensive use in previous research is that its validity and reliability have been established. The presence of these two properties is essential if a survey instrument is to have any value in research. Reliability of the research instrument is essential to allow for confidence that the results will be repeatable if the same behaviors are measured again. Validity is also important because it allows one to determine if the measure does actually measure what one hopes it does (Goodwin, 2002).

In the case of the SRQ-A and POPS, validity and reliability have been tested and proven to be acceptably high. Internal consistency for the SRQ-A subscales range from .62 to .82, and extensive evidence for construct validity has been provided by Ryan and Connell. Cronbach's alphas for POPS were .53 on maternal autonomy support; .56 for maternal involvement; .67 for paternal support, and .64 for paternal involvement (Ryan and Connell, 1989; Golnick, Deci, and Ryan, 1991, 1997).

Self-Regulation Questionnaire-Academic

The SRQ-A (Appendix C) was designed specifically for use with students in late elementary and middle school. It consists of a total of 32 questions, asking why students do various school-related behaviors designed to measure four levels of a participant's educational motivation, external regulation, introjected regulation, identified regulation and intrinsic regulation. The responses to each question are given on a four-point Likert scale of Very true, Sort of true, Not very true, and Not at all true. The following Table 3-1 lists a sample of the reasons defining each of the four categories of motivation.

Table 3-1: Examples of Reasons Defining External, Introjected, Identified, and Intrinsic Categories (Adapted from Ryan and Connell, 1989, p.752)

External (rule following; avoidance of punishment)
Because I'll get in trouble if I don't
Because that's what I'm supposed to do
So that the teacher won't yell at me
Because that's the rule
So others won't get mad at me
Introjection (self-and other-approval; avoidance of disapproval)
Because I want the teacher to think I'm a good student
Because I will feel bad about myself if I don't
Because I'll feel ashamed of myself if I don't
Because I want the other students to think I'm smart
Because it bothers me when I don't

Identification (self-valued goal; personal importance)
Because I want to understand English
Because I want to learn new things
To find out if I'm right or wrong
Intrinsic (enjoyment; fun)
Because it's fun
Because I enjoy it

The scale also has a built-in scoring system, designating the questions associated with each type of motivation, with Very true scored as four, Sort of true as three and so on. Listed below are the item numbers associated with each of the four subscales:

External Regulation: 2, 6, 9, 14, 20, 24, 25, 28, 32

Introjected Regulation: 1, 4, 10, 12, 17, 18, 26, 29, 31

Identified Regulation: 5, 8, 11, 16, 21, 23, 30

Intrinsic Regulation: 3, 7, 13, 15, 19, 22, 27

Besides using the individual subscale scores in data analysis, the researcher can also produce a Relative Autonomy Index (RAI) for each student by use of the following formula:

$$2 \times \text{Intrinsic} + \text{Identified} - \text{Introjected} - 2 \times \text{External}$$

Both these types of data analysis were used to determine individual measurements of motivation for these students. A full copy of this instrument is attached at Appendix C.

Because of the collectivist orientation of this study, I slightly modified the SRQ-A, to add one additional question, number 33 (See Appendix C), for the purpose of determining the direct family influence on student motivation for studying EFL. This question was scored the same way as the others, and was worded as follows:

Why do I try to do well in English?

Because I would like to please my parents and my family members.

(1) Very true (2) Sort of true (3) Not very true (4) Not at all true

Perceptions of Parents Scales

A second research instrument, referred to above as the POPS (Appendix E), is designed to assess children's perceptions of the degree to which their parents are involved and are supportive of their children's individual autonomy. Parental involvement means mothers and fathers being available to their children and being knowledgeable and concerned about their children's lives. The POPS consists of 22 items, 11 items related to mothers and 11 related to fathers. By factor analysis, the scale has demonstrated a four-factor solution labeled mother autonomy support, mother involvement, father autonomy support, and father involvement. Parents each get a score on the degree to which they are involved in their children's lives and are autonomy supportive. The instructions for scoring the scale are included in the survey, and researchers are first to score the following items on a scale from 1 to 4 (i.e., the four options are ordered from being low on the subscale to being high): 1, 4, 7, 9, 10, 12, 15, 18, 20, 21, then, to score the following items from 4 to 1 (i.e., the four options are ordered from being high on the subscale to being low): 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17, 19, 22. The following subscale scores are then computed by averaging all items within a given subscale (See Appendix E).

Mother Autonomy Support: 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 10

Mother Involvement: 1, 3, 5, 9, 11

Father Autonomy Support: 13, 15, 17, 18, 19, 21

Father Involvement: 12, 14, 16, 20, 22

Data collected from this scale were analyzed in accordance with this rubric. A copy of this scale is included in Appendix E.

DATA ANALYSIS

Coding of the data was performed using Excel and analysis of the data was conducted by the use of SPSS for Windows.

With respect to research questions 1 and 3, data collected by the SRQ-A and POPS were used to discover the overall motivational pattern of these Korean middle school students and how they perceived their parents' involvement and support for their autonomy. For the purpose of these research questions, descriptive statistics were employed including mean scores, standard deviations, and ranges.

Regarding the analysis of research questions 2 and 4, the results from the SRQ-A and POPS were used to determine the relationship of self-reported classroom achievement to their pattern of motivation and these students' perceptions of parental involvement and support for their autonomy. Correlation coefficients were developed using Pearson's r to show the correlation between these two sets of variables and self-reported classroom achievement.

With regard to research question 5, an analysis was performed to indicate the relationship of each type of motivation and students' perceptions for their parents' involvement and support for autonomy. Correlation coefficients were produced using Pearson's r to show the correlation between these two variables.

In addition, question #33 was added to the SRQ-A questionnaire to determine how student motivation is influenced by their family members and also the data were analyzed by how many boys or girls answered positively or negatively. This question

was also related to self-reported classroom achievement to determine the correlation between these two variables.

The data from the self-reported achievement survey, such as the amount of time spent in studying English, mid-term score in English and student confidence in mastering English in the future, was also developed by the use of correlation coefficients to find out the relationship between these variables.

TRANSLATION OF THE INSTRUMENTS

These instruments, and indeed the entire survey procedure, were translated and administered in Korean. The method of translation was a very important consideration to the success of the study. In reviewing the English version of the survey, I did not see any cultural conflicts within the wording of the questions themselves. The procedure used for translation is taken from Brislin (1986) and Vallerand et al. (1992), and is referred to as back-translation. This involved one bilingual, myself, translating the scale from English to Korean, and another bilingual retranslating from Korean to English without the use of the original scale. No problems or conflicts were found, thus it was assumed "there must be readily available words and phrases in the two languages which the translators could use" (Brislin, 1986, p. 160).

As Brislin indicates, back-translation is not a final answer to ensuring adequate translation and, if possible, all materials should be pre-tested with a population similar to the one to be used in the study. This pre-test was accomplished by administering the survey instruments to several Korean children, including several of my family members of a similar age to the participants in this study, and no difficulties were encountered in understanding the questions and completing the answers. These pre-test students were

given the same instructions for completing the surveys as the students who participated in the study itself, and they easily and quickly answered the questions.

CHAPTER 4: RESULTS OF DATA ANALYSIS

This chapter will discuss the results of the analysis of the data collected for each of the five research questions. The data collected for research questions #1 and #3 involve simple descriptive statistics and tests for statistical significance. For questions #2, #4, and #5, exploratory correlation data will be shown in Table 4-13.

RESEARCH QUESTION #1

What is the motivational pattern of Korean middle school students learning English as a foreign language, from a SDT perspective, as measured by the Self-Regulation Questionnaire-Academic (SRQ-A)?

The analysis of this research question provides us with a picture of the motivational stance of these students. Analysis of the data from the SRQ-A survey suggests that these students were extrinsically motivated to study English, with identified regulation, which is the most internalized form of extrinsic regulation, being the most frequent reason cited, followed by external regulation, introjected regulation, and with intrinsic regulation the lowest rated reason for studying English. This pattern is shown below in Table 4-1.

Table 4-1: Descriptive Statistics for SRQ-A

	External	Introjected	Identified	Intrinsic
Mean	2.520	2.401	2.654	2.146
Std. Deviation	0.436	0.625	0.630	0.670
Range	2.222	3.000	2.857	3.000
N	167	167	167	167

Valid N (listwise) 167

This order of identified, external, introjected and intrinsic is identical to motivational patterns found for similar populations in a U.S. study, which will be discussed further in Chapter 5.

As indicated in the Table 4-1, the differences in mean scores appear to be very small, especially between identified and external, and external and introjected. Thus these results were tested to see if the differences among mean scores of the four subscales were statistically significant.

As this study has four motivational levels, it is required to see whether the multivariate normality was violated or not, and Mauchly's test of sphericity was performed. As shown in Table 4-2 and 4-3, the results of the test showed the violation of the multivariate normality.

Table 4-2: Multivariate Tests

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.
FACTOR 1	Wilks' Lambda	0.479	59.399	3	164	0.000

Table 4-3: Mauchly's Test of Sphericity

Within Subjects Effect	Mauchly's W	Approx Chi-Square	df	Sig.	Epsilon Greenhouse-Geisser	Hyunh-Feldt	Lower-bound
FACTOR 1	0.691	60.810	5	0.001	0.797	0.810	0.333

Next, because the assumption of multivariate normality was violated, the original df was adjusted by multiplying by the Greenhouse-Geisser Epsilon, with the result that the df was reduced to 2.391 as shown below in Table 4-4.

Table 4-4: Tests of Within-Subjects Effects

Source		Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
FACTOR 1	Sphericity Assumed	23.353	3.000	7.784	57.170	0.001
	Greenhouse-Geisser	23.353	2.391	9.766	57.170	0.001
Error(FACTOR1)	Sphericity Assumed	67.808	498.000	0.136		
	Greenhouse-Geisser	67.808	396.944	0.171		

From Table 4-4, the F test showed that the mean differences are statistically significant at the .01 level.

Finally, a Post-hoc test was performed to determine which mean differences are statistically significant. The results of this test are shown below in Table 4-5.

Table 4-5: Post-hoc Test

(I) FACTOR 1	(J) FACTOR 1	Mean Difference(I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval for Difference	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	2	0.119	0.031	0.001	0.036	0.202
External	3	-0.134	0.033	0.001	-0.223	-0.045
	4	0.374	0.044	0.001	0.256	0.492
2	1	-0.119	0.031	0.001	-0.202	-0.036
Introjected	3	-0.253	0.039	0.001	-0.358	-0.149
	4	0.255	0.051	0.001	0.120	0.390
3	1	0.134	0.033	0.001	0.045	0.223
Identified	2	0.253	0.039	0.001	0.149	0.358
	4	0.508	0.041	0.001	0.399	0.617
4	1	-0.374	0.044	0.001	-0.492	-0.256
Intrinsic	2	-0.255	0.051	0.001	-0.390	-0.120
	3	-0.508	0.041	0.001	-0.617	-0.399

Based on estimated marginal means

*** The mean difference is significant at the .001 level.

a Adjustment for multiple comparisons: Bonferroni.

Table 4-5 shows that mean differences among all four subscales are statistically significant.

A further analysis of these motivational patterns was done to determine the percentage of students in each of the four categories by gender. As suggested by Table 4-6 below, the main differences are that boys show more identified regulation than girls, and the girls are much more introjected than boys. Boys and girls count indicates the number of boys and girls who score highest in each motivation category. The % line shows the percent of boys and girls in each category against the total number of the two gender populations.

Table 4-6: Gender Differences in Motivation Pattern

		External	Introjected	Identified	Intrinsic	N
Boys	Count	11.5*	5	25	5.5	47
	%	24	11	53	12	100
	Mean	2.54	2.98	3.02	2.87	
Girls	Count	29.5	25.5	51	11	117
	%	25	22	44	9	100
	Mean	2.45	3.03	2.88	3.07	
Total	Count	41	30.5	76	16.5	164
	%	25	19	46	10	100

* When one student indicates two motivation types tied for highest, decimal numbers reflect the averages of the identical mean scores.

RESEARCH QUESTION #3

How do these students perceive their parental involvement and support for their autonomy, as measured by the Perceptions of Parents Scales (POPS)?

Analysis of this research question provides us with a view of the influence of student perceptions of parental support and autonomy. Regarding student perceptions of parental involvement and autonomy, it is clearly evident from Table 4-7 below there is a

mixed pattern of results, with mother involvement being perceived by students as being higher than any other. Comparing mother involvement (MI) and father involvement (FI), the students perceived that their mothers were more involved with their school work than their fathers, but when mother autonomy support (MA) is compared with father autonomy support (FA), students thought their father supported their autonomy slightly more than their mothers.

Table 4-7: Descriptive Statistics for POPS

	MA	MI	FA	FI
Mean	2.485	3.072	2.609	2.580
Std. Deviation	0.440	0.546	0.522	0.636
Range	2.667	2.800	2.833	3.000
N	162	162	162	162

MA: Mother Autonomy Support MI: Mother Involvement
FA: Father Autonomy Support FI: Father Involvement

The above results were tested to see if the differences between mean scores of the four subscales were statistically significant. First, in order to see whether the multivariate normality was satisfied, Mauchly's test of sphericity was performed. As shown in Table 4-8 and 4-9, the results of the test showed that the assumption of multivariate normality was not seriously violated.

Table 4-8: Multivariate Tests

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.
FACTOR 1	Wilks' Lambda	0.500	52.939	3	159	0.001

Table 4-9: Mauchly's Test of Sphericity

Within Subjects Effect	Mauchly's W	Approx Chi-Square	df	Sig.	Epsilon Greenhouse-Geisser	Hyun Feldt	Lower-bound
FACTOR 1	0.959	6.759	5	0.239	0.973	0.992	0.333

Next, through the tests of within-subjects effects, it was shown that mean differences existed among these four subscales. The results are shown in Table 4-10.

Table 4-10: Tests of Within-Subjects Effects

Source		TypeIII Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
FACTOR 1	Sphericity Assumed	33.432	3.000	11.144	46.886	0.001
	Greenhouse-Geisser	33.432	2.918	11.459	46.886	0.001
Error(FACTOR1)	Sphericity Assumed	114.800	483	0.238		
	Greenhouse-Geisser	114.800	496.723	0.244		

Table 4-10 showed that the mean differences are statistically significant at the .01 level.

In order to determine which mean differences are statistically significant, a Post-hoc test was performed. The results of this test are shown below in Table 4-11.

Table 4-11: Post-hoc Test

(I) FACTOR 1	(J) FACTOR 1	Mean Difference(I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval for Difference	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	2	-0.587*	0.050	0.001	-0.721	-0.453
	3	-0.124	0.051	0.098	-0.261	0.012
	4	-0.096	0.056	0.525	-0.244	0.053
2	1	0.587*	0.050	0.001	0.453	0.721
	3	0.463*	0.056	0.001	0.313	0.612
	4	0.491*	0.053	0.001	0.350	0.633
3	1	0.124	0.051	0.098	-0.012	0.261
	2	-0.463*	0.056	0.001	-0.612	-0.313
	4	0.029	0.059	1.000	-0.128	0.185
4	1	0.096	0.056	0.525	-0.053	0.244
	2	-0.491*	0.053	0.001	-0.633	-0.350
	3	-0.029	0.059	1.000	-0.185	0.128

Based on estimated marginal means
* The mean difference is significant at the .05 level
a Adjustment for multiple comparisons: Bonferroni.
1: Mother Autonomy Support 2: Mother Involvement
3: Father Autonomy Support 4: Father Involvement

As indicated in Table 4-11, only these three pairs, mother involvement (MI) and mother autonomy support (MA), mother involvement (MI) and father autonomy support (FA), mother involvement (MI) and father involvement (FI), are statistically significant at the .05 level. Mother involvement (MI) is higher than everything else.

A further analysis of the POPS was done to determine the perceptions of students in each of the four categories, by gender. As suggested by Table 4-12 below, the main differences seem to be that boys perceived father involvement to be greater than father autonomy suopport. The girls perceived father autonomy support to be greater than father involvement. Both boys and girls perceived mother involvement to be much greater than mother autonomy support. The difference in gender perception of father

autonomy support and father involvement could be explained by the greater influence by fathers on their sons, in the Confucian tradition. Boys and girls count indicates the number of boys and girls in each category of the POPS. The % line shows the percent of boys and girls in each category against the total number of the two gender populations.

Table 4-12: Gender Differences in POPS

		MA	MI	FA	FI	Total
Boys	Count	4.5*	25	6.5	9	45
	%	10	56	14	20	100
	Mean	3.26	3.08	3.03	3.15	
Girls	Count	10	70.5	20	16.5	117
	%	9	60	17	14	100
	Mean	2.92	3.40	3.16	3.35	
Total	Count	14.5	95.5	26.5	25.5	162
	%	9	59	16	16	100

* When one student indicates two categories of POPS tied for highest, decimal numbers reflect the average of the identical mean scores.

Below Table 4-13 summarizes correlations for research questions # 2, 4 and 5.

Table 4-13: Correlations among subscales of the POPS, SRQ-A, and Classroom Achievement

	MA	MI	FA	FI	POPS	EX	IJ	ID	IN	RAI	ACH
MA											
Corr	—										
Sig.											
N											
MI											
Corr	.170*	—									
Sig.	.030										
N	162										
FA											
Corr	.087	.115	—								
Sig.	.270	.146									
N	162	162									
FI											
Corr	.172*	.356**	.185*	—							
Sig.	.029	.000	.019								
N	162	162	162								
POPS											
Corr	.509**	.672**	.549**	.743**	—						
Sig.	.000	.000	.000	.000							
N	162	162	162	162							
EX											
Corr	.039	.046	.003	-.033	.017	—					
Sig.	.625	.565	.969	.679	.832						
N	162	162	162	162	162						
IJ											
Corr	.079	.057	-.055	-.062	-.001	.772*	—				
Sig.	.318	.469	.490	.435	.986	.000					
N	162	162	162	162	162	167					
ID											
Corr	.134	.064	-.044	.033	.068	.733**	.675**	—			
Sig.	.089	.421	.579	.675	.389	.000	.000				
N	162	162	162	162	162	167	167				
IN											
Corr	.225**	.168*	.000	.133	.204**	.536**	.490**	.673**	—		
Sig.	.004	.032	.995	.093	.009	.000	.000	.000			
N	162	162	162	162	162	167	167	167			
RAI											
Corr	.220**	.138	.002	.192*	.219**	-.126	-.156*	.341*	.717**	—	
Sig.	.005	.080	.977	.014	.005	.106	.044	.000	.000		
N	162	162	162	162	162	167	167	167	167		
ACH											
Corr	.140	.091	-.083	.025	.062	.289**	.201*	.386**	.364**	.257**	—
Sig.	.081	.259	.300	.753	.437	.000	.011	.000	.000	.001	
N	157	157	157	157	157	159	159	159	159	159	

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level.
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01level.

MA: Mother Autonomy Support MI: Mother Involvement FA: Father Autonomy Support
FI: Father Involvement POPS: Total of POPS EX: External Regulation
IJ: Introjected Regulation ID: Identified Regulation IN: Intrinsic Regulation
RAI: Relative Autonomy Index ACH: Classroom Achievement in English

RESEARCH QUESTION #2

What is the correlation between the results of SRQ-A and these stduents' self-report of classroom achievement in English?

Analysis of this research question measures the relationship between student motivational patterns and their self-reported classroom achievement. The results of this analysis are shown in Table 4-13. The Relative Autonomy Index (RAI), developed from the SRQ-A survey results for these students, shows a relationship with their classroom achievement in English at .26. This finding is shown as statistically significant.

As to the four types of motivation that make up the RAI and their correlation with achievement, each of them shows a positive relationship, but not in a descending order of relative internalization as might be expected, with identified being the highest followed by intrinsic regulation. These numbers are statistically significant.

Of the four subscales within the RAI, external regulation and introjected regulation show a negative correlation with the total score, while the other two identified and intrinsic regulation are positively correlated, with intrinsic regulation correlated at .72. Except for external regulation these figures are statistically significant. This result is as expected and is in accordance with the internalization continuum posited by SDT theory, wherein intrinsic regulation is the most autonomous form, followed by identified regulation. These findings tend to lend credibility to the notion of the universality of SDT, which will be discussed further in Chapter 5.

RESEARCH QUESTION #4

What is the correlation between the results of the POPS and these students' self-report of classroom achievement in English?

Analysis of this research question measures the relationship between student perceptions of parental support and autonomy and their self-reported classroom achievement. The results for this question are also displayed in Table 4-13. The total POPS score is shown to be correlated with classroom achievement at .06, not significant.

As to the four subscales of the POPS and their correlation to classroom achievement, three of them show a relationship of .14 with mother autonomy support, .09 with mother involvement, .03 with father involvement, and -.08 with father autonomy support. These numbers are not statistically significant. This finding is also in line with similar studies done in the U.S, which will be further reviewed in Chapter 5, and also may contribute to the notion of universality for SDT.

RESEARCH QUESTION #5

What are the correlations among scales and subscales of the SRQ-A and the POPS?

Analysis of this research question measures the relationship between student motivational patterns and perceptions of parental support and addresses the question of what kind of impact does perception of parental support have on student motivation. The results for this question are also shown in Table 4-13. The RAI (Relative Autonomy Index) developed from the SRQ-A shows a slightly positive relationship at .22 with the POPS, which is statistically significant.

The correlations between the RAI and the four subscales of the POPS show mother autonomy support being the highest at .22. The figures for mother autonomy support and father involvement are statistically significant.

The correlation between the POPS and the four subscales of the RAI shows intrinsic regulation being the highest at .20, which is statistically significant.

Regarding the correlations among subscales of the RAI, external regulation has the highest relationship with introjected regulation at .77, with identified being next at .73, and intrinsic at .54. This result is in accord with the SDT internalization continuum.

With regard to the correlations among the subscales of the POPS, the correlation between mother involvement and father involvement is the highest at .36. This figure is statistically significant. The POPS and the four subscales are correlated, with father involvement being the highest at .74.

RESULTS FROM SELF-REPORT OF ACHIEVEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

The intent of this questionnaire was to measure relationships between students' time spent studying English, confidence in future proficiency, and self-report of achievement in current English class. The results are as shown below in Table 4-14.

Table 4-14: Correlations among Time (TIME), Confidence (CON) and Classroom Achievement (ACH)

		TIME	CON	ACH
TIME	Corr	—		
	Sig			
	N			
CON	Corr	0.272**	—	
	Sig	0.001		
	N	164		
ACH	Corr	0.416**	0.272**	—
	Sig	0.001	0.001	
	N	159	159	

** Correlation is significant at the 0.001 level.

Table 4-14 shows the highest positive correlation is between time spent studying and classroom achievement, which may be an expected outcome. This Table also shows these results to be statistically significant.

SRQ-A QUESTION #33

Why do I try to do well in English?

Because I would like to please my parents and my family members.

(1) Very true (2) Sort of true (3) Not very true (4) Not at all true

This question was added to the SRQ-A to determine gender difference in responses to questions about the extent of family influence on why they study English.

Of the total number of students, 60% answered positively. By gender, girls answered in the positive 62% of the time, and boys 56%. As shown below in Table 4-15, the correlation between concern for family influence and student classroom achievement is found to be only .07.

Table 4-15: Correlation between #33 and Classroom Achievement (ACH)

		# 33	ACH
# 33	Corr	—	
	Sig		
	N		
ACH	Corr	0.071	—
	Sig	0.371	
	N	159	

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSIONS, PEDAGOGIC IMPLICATIONS AND LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

This chapter will outline the research questions involved in this study, review the principal findings and results, and compare them with similar studies done in the United States. Limitations of the study and possible classroom implications will be considered, followed by recommendations for possible future research and conclusions.

The five research questions for this study were as follows:

1. What is the motivational pattern of Korean middle school students learning English as a foreign language, from a SDT perspective, as measured by the Self-Regulation Questionnaire-Academic (SRQ-A)?
2. What is the correlation between the results of SRQ-A and these students' self-report of classroom achievement in English?
3. How do these students perceive their parental involvement and support for their autonomy, as measured by the Perceptions of Parents Scales (POPS)?
4. What is the correlation between the results of POPS and these students' self-report of classroom achievement in English?
5. What are the correlations among the scales and subscales of the SRQ-A and the POPS?

These research questions were posed for the purpose of exploring more fully the motivational stance of Korean middle school students studying English as a Foreign Language in a collectivist-oriented setting, and what the effect these motivational patterns may have on classroom achievement. These questions were also set forth to gain insight into the utility of SDT in explaining educational motivation on a cross-cultural basis, and what may be some possible pedagogic implications for the SLL classroom.

As indicated in Chapter 1, a basic and underlying construct for this study was the strong anecdotal and empirical evidence of the high educational motivation of Koreans, and whether or not SDT can provide a meaningful theoretical framework for understanding this phenomenon. Studies using SDT have primarily been done in individualistic-oriented western settings, and only a very few have addressed its relevance for more collectivist-oriented contexts. As also pointed out in Chapter 1, there has been a strong tendency in the west to accept the results of studies done in the west as universal. Studies such as this one done in a collectivist-oriented setting may provide some clearer insight as to the actual universality of the concepts of SDT.

DISCUSSION OF PRINCIPAL FINDINGS OF THIS STUDY

With respect to research question #1, the data suggest that this population of Korean middle school students were, in fact, extrinsically motivated to study English, with identified regulation (M=2.65), which is the most highly internalized form of extrinsic regulation measured for this study, being cited most often as a reason for studying English. This reason was followed in order by external regulation (M=2.52), introjected regulation (M=2.40) and intrinsic regulation (M=2.15).

It is interesting to compare this result with a study done in the U.S. (Ryan and Connell, 1989), among a similar although slightly younger population of students in upstate New York, who were asked their reasons for doing homework; working on classwork, trying to answer questions in class, and their overall attempt to try and do well in school, from the perspective of the SDT continuum. Even though the total mean scores for each of the four SDT elements were somewhat higher in the case of the U.S. students (identified M=3.23, external M=2.85, introjected M=2.71, intrinsic M=2.32), the pattern of motivation is identical to that found in the present study with the Korean

students. Thus, for both studies, the greatest difference in mean level is between the identified and intrinsic elements, which suggest that these students in both groups clearly discriminate between these two levels of motivation.

Another comparable study done in the United States, although done with high school and college age students, was designed to show how the degree of academic self-regulation would effect the transition to graduation and beyond. Academic self-regulation levels were measured shortly prior to graduation and again at six months to a year after graduation. The findings showed that identified regulation but not intrinsic motivation was most related to these students' positive adaptation to life after graduation. It was clear that it was not enough for these students to view their schoolwork as interesting and enjoyable, but they also needed to view it as personally important and consistent with their own values (Koestner, Losier, Fichman, and Mallet, 1998).

Another study done among American students in a sixth-grade science classroom, and previously mentioned under Literature Review, further demonstrated the importance of identified regulation in the classroom. It was found that students, who were motivated to learn science but had no basic intrinsic interest in the subject, consistently pursued learning goals when engaged in science classroom activities. However, students who were not motivated to learn science, but had an intrinsic interest in the subject, only pursued learning goals during science classroom activities that were considered as fun and enjoyable (Lee and Brophy, 1996).

Another study also done in Canada, although conducted in the political domain, showed the strong dominance of identified regulation over intrinsic motivation in causing voters to turn out (Losier and Koestner, 1999).

Although these comparative studies are few in number, I would suggest that these almost identical results would tend to convey the notion that human motivation at the

identified level can be more important than intrinsic regulation in achieving positive outcomes, including in the classroom. Furthermore, because the findings were similar between this study and those done in North America, it may be possible to make some tentative conclusion about the cross-cultural applicability of SDT.

With regard to research question #3, which deals with students' perception of parental involvement in their education and support for their autonomy as measured by the POPS, mothers were thought to be more involved in the sense that they were perceived to show interest and spend time relating to their child's school activities, but fathers were thought to be more supportive to autonomy in the sense that they were perceived to encourage their children to make their own choices rather than apply pressure to control these choices. Descriptive data from a study done in the U.S. using the POPS (Grolnick, Ryan, and Deci, 1991), on a similar although younger population, showed that students' self-report of perceptions revealed more autonomy support from their parents than in this study on Korean students.

Research questions #2, #4, and #5 all dealt with the relationships between the SRQ-A and the POPS and classroom achievement, and between the SRQ-A and the POPS. Question #2 shows the correlation between results from the SRQ-A and student self-report of classroom achievement. Each of the four subscales that make up the motivation continuum suggests a positive relationship with classroom achievement, however, not in the order that some might expect, with motivation at the identified level again being the highest correlation, followed by intrinsic. This appears to further establish the primacy of identified regulation in learning for children at this level of development, as suggested by Brophy (1999) and others based on studies done in the west, and again speaks to the concept of the universality of SDT.

The correlations of the four subscales within the relative autonomy index (RAI), the formula of which is 2 x Intrinsic + Identified – Introjected – 2 x External, are as expected, except for external and introjected subscales. The intrinsic subscale had the highest correlation at .72. In other words, autonomy as measured in the four levels of self-regulation; external, introjected, identified and intrinsic, is most highly related to intrinsic motivation when compared to extrinsic motivation.

Research question #4 explored the correlation between the results of the POPS survey and student self-report of classroom achievement in English. This correlation seems to suggest no relationship between these two variables with the correlation at .06. But there are two other possible explanations for this low correlation: (1) Parents are already so highly involved in students' classroom achievement, and there is little variation in the students' responses therefore the correlation would be low; (2) The instrument is not appropriate for measuring these Korean students. As to the four subscales of the POPS and their correlations with classroom achievement, again there are virtually no relationships, with mother autonomy support (MA) at .14, mother involvement (MI) at .09, father autonomy support (FA) at -.08 and father involvement (FI) at .02.

For most people, this lack of relationship may be surprising, as intuitively it might be expected that student perceptions of mother and father support and involvement would have a stronger impact on their achievement. However, these results are in line with the data shown in the Grolnick, Ryan, and Deci (1991) study which evidenced a very similar weak relationship with mother autonomy support (MA) at .10, mother involvement (MI) at -.08, father autonomy support (FA) at .02, and father involvement (FI) at .01. The compatibility between the findings of these two studies again points in the direction of a

broad general applicability of the concepts of SDT within both collectivist-oriented and more individualistic educational contexts.

Research question #5 dealt with more generalized correlations between the various scales and subscales of the POPS and the SRQ-A. One finding of interest in this section was the correlation among subscales of the RAI showing that external regulation has the highest relationship with introjected level at .77, with the identified level being next at .73, and intrinsic level at .53. This pattern is in accordance with the SDT autonomy continuum, where each of these elements is hypothesized to be related in the same order.

In summary, the results from the five research questions of this study show that the Korean middle school students who participated in this research were extrinsically motivated at the identified level in the EFL classroom. Also, these students were not highly influenced by their perceptions of parental involvement and support for their autonomy. Furthermore, the relationship between these Korean students' academic achievement and their motivational patterns was found to be only .26 with the RAI, accounting for less than 2% of the variance. The relationship between the POPS and academic achievement for these students was unexpectedly very low, and in the case of father autonomy support was negative. As for the relationship between the RAI and the subscales of the POPS, mother autonomy support has the highest relationship compared to other subscales.

CONCLUSION

As an overall conclusion, it may be stated that this study was an attempt to determine the nature of classroom motivation among middle school students in a collectivist-oriented context from a SDT perspective, and, at the same time, examine the

universality of SDT as a means for understanding such motivation. As indicated from the findings, these Korean students were extrinsically motivated to perform in their English studies, and intrinsic motivation was not an important factor. This motivational pattern was identical to their counterparts in the North America, as shown by similar studies.

It is also of interest that parental influence on English classroom achievement is not strong. This could be a function of the age level of these students, and younger children may have a different predisposition. This finding was also similar to that of studies done in the United States among a little younger population of students.

This finding is surprising because, intuitively and by definition, collectivist-oriented societies would be expected to display a strong continuing influence between family members throughout life. One other question to ask may be whether this lessening of parental influence reflects the impact of western values on these Korean students as they get older.

Lastly, this study seems to suggest that SDT may have some cross-cultural application, at least with this student population level, and therefore such a theory can be useful in understanding educational motivation in all settings.

PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

The results of this study, from the perspective of SDT, would seem to indicate the following:

(1) That, at least for students in the middle grades of school in Korea, the primary motivating force for learning in the classroom is extrinsic, and highest at the identified level of internalization. Despite what may have been expected, Korean middle school students' apparent strong motivation to learn English stems not from intrinsic reasons,

but is driven from an internalized form of extrinsic sources. For Koreans, it is easy to understand from where such external forces originate.

The teachings of Confucius have had a profound effect on Korean social, cultural and educational development. That influence, although modified by modernization and economic development, still plays a powerful role in everyday life for Koreans (Seth, 2002; Rozman, 1991). These traditional values have had an especially strong impact on Koreans' ideas about education. For Confucius, education was essential to reach full human potential and for training citizens to take their role in society and government. An uneducated man remained essentially on the same level as the animal and would not be able to function in society.

A major theme of Confucian teaching is that a state should be governed by individuals of talent and virtue and these people were to be chosen by way of civil examination system, and the educational system was developed to prepare students to pass this examination. Thus, Korea was always a society where formal learning was a major concern (Kim, 2000), and this has carried over to the present day.

Another major principle of Confucian thought has to do with the theory of intelligence. For Confucius, ability is not as important as effort. Any lack of basic ability can be overcome by effort, thus if you try hard enough, you can achieve everything. Therefore, failure in the classroom is blamed on a lack of effort and not lack of ability. So Korean parents and students are willing to sacrifice all for greater effort, and they are extremely motivated to work hard to achieve success.

From infancy, Korean students are taught by their parents about these traditional Confucian values, and they become a part of their motivation to learn and develop their full potential. In order to help their children achieve academically Korean parents show a particular willingness to sacrifice so their children can achieve this goal.

Along with these traditional cultural and social reasons for high academic motivation, including the learning of English, Koreans also show a high level of what Robert Gardner refers to as instrumental motivation. This is the pursuit of learning in order to pass an exam, or to acquire a high-status job or a higher salary. This is especially true with the changing economic situation of the past twenty years, where the ability to speak English is highly desired by employers.

The lesson here for classroom pedagogy seems to be that, as van Lier (1996), Brophy (1999) and other scholars have pointed out, intrinsic motivation alone is not sufficient for students to achieve in the classroom. Learning is essentially not always fun or interesting in and of itself, and "students will not move with sufficient enthusiasm and alacrity towards the goals of exemplary citizenship and outstanding academic achievement, if guided by nothing more than intrinsic motivation" (van Lier, 1996, p. 110).

As Ryan (1995) further indicates, "the lion's share of social development concerns the assimilation of culturally transmitted behavioral regulations and valuations that are neither spontaneous nor inherently satisfying" (p. 405). There has to be some other outside or extrinsic force to maximize student learning, and, as seen in this study, and as described by Brophy, this is primarily the most internalized form of extrinsic motivation, that of identified regulation.

Teachers, therefore, need to concentrate their efforts at enhancing student levels of identified regulation, reducing dependence upon purely external or introjected forms of control, and not worrying about how much intrinsic motivation a student may or may not display. I believe SDT provides us with valuable insight as to how this notion is applicable across the broad spectrum of educational settings. As indicated above, for Koreans, their fervor for education is fired by their long historic and cultural legacy and

Confucian tradition, which has been internalized by Korean children at the identified level from an early age, and which seemingly accounts for this motivational phenomenon.

(2) Another primary implication from this study is the ostensible support given to the idea of the universality of SDT. In several instances this is evident when comparing data collected in this study with other studies done with similar populations in the U.S.

However, prior to beginning this study, it was my impression that Korean cultural influences were primarily responsible for establishing students' motivational patterns. But the results of this study might seem to suggest that, despite enormous cultural, social and economic differences, middle school children in at least the societies studied so far (and perhaps all societies), react very similarly and are motivated by the same forces to learn in the classroom. Further, SDT provides educators in all educational contexts a viable framework for understanding these classroom reactions, and especially as they apply to motivational behavior in the classroom.

(3) A third implication based on the findings of this study relates to the apparent low parental influence on these middle school students, especially their classroom achievement, at least in studying English as a Foreign Language. In the case of this study, the relationships between these Korean students' classroom achivevement and their mother involvement (MI), father involvement (FI), mother autonomy support (MA), and father autonomy support (FA) were at the levels of .09, .03, .14, and -.08 respectively. In the U.S. study (Grolnick, Deci, and Ryan, 1991), the relationships between students' classroom achievement and their mother involvement (MI), father involvement (FI), mother autonomy support (MA) and father autonomy support (FA) were at the levels of -.08, -.01, .10, and .02 respectively. Based on these findings, it may be tentatively concluded that low parental influence exists in both collectivist and

individualistic settings for this student population, ranging in age from 11 to 15. Further research would be needed to confirm such a conclusion.

In Korea it may be the case that the Confucian values about education from parents are internalized at an early age, and this influence wanes at the middle school level. Further research in this area needs to be done to determine if elementary age students show a different reaction to parental influence. An implication may be that all the time spent in engaging parents in their children's schooling, such as Parent-Teacher Associations in the U. S., may be of limited value at this level, especially where this correlation is shown to be zero, as in the case of the fathers.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Dörnyei (2001) indicates that there are three unique features of motivation that pose a particular problem for the researcher:

1. *Motivation is abstract and not directly observable*. "Motivation" is an abstract term that refers to various mental (i.e. internal) processes and states. It is therefore *not* subject to direct observation but must be inferred from some indirect indicator, such as the individual's *self-report accounts*, *over behaviors or physiological responses* (e.g. change of blood pressure). This means that there are no objective measures of motivation; all the motivation indices used in research studies are inherently subjective, and one of the most difficult tasks of the motivation researcher is to keep this level of subjectivity to a minimum.
2. *Motivation is a multidimensional construct*. Motivation is a multifaceted concept that cannot be represented by means of simple measures (e.g. the results of a few questionnaire items). Researchers need to bear this in mind

when conceptualizing and assessing motivation variables, and should also be aware of the fact that the specific motivation measure or concept they are focusing on is likely to represent only a segment of a more intricate psychological construct.

3. *Motivation is inconstant*. Motivation is not stable but changes dynamically over time. It is therefore questionable how accurately a one-off examination (e.g. the administration of a questionnaire at a single point of time) can represent the motivational basis of a prolonged behavioral sequence such as L2 learning (pp. 185-186).

It is important for a researcher to keep these three limitations in mind in selecting appropriate methodology for their studies in educational motivation because ignoring these limitations could have a serious negative impact on the viability of the research data.

Because of the relatively small sample size in this present study, it may be difficult to generalize about findings. Also, confining the study participants to middle school students may further restrict relevance of study results to a broader population. Whatever the results may be, it would be necessary to conduct further study among larger and more varied samples of Korean students studying EFL, to determine its replicability among the Korean population as a whole.

Also, the fact that the male participants in this study were from a co-educational class, and the females were from a girls' only classroom, may have had some impact on their responses to the surveys, as their motivation to learn English could be influenced by the different classroom environment. The girls in the co-educational classroom may react to the survey questions in a different way from the girls in the girls' only classes. These situations could be matters for further research.

In studies of older participants, it may also be of some value to include the measurement of extrinsic motivation at the integrated level, which this study did not include, for a more complete portrayal of student motivation.

Another limitation lies in the cross-sectional nature of this investigation. For example, if it is found that student autonomy enhances classroom motivation, it may also be conceivable that high levels of motivation leads people to view their behaviors as more autonomous. Longitudinal reviews, such as diary studies over a period of time, could further help to determine the exact nature of the relationship between these variables.

Another study limitation lies in the fact that research data for this study were collected in an EFL classroom. If data were collected in another subject area, the results may be quite different because studying English in Korea, generally speaking, has unique motivational characteristics.

The fact that the instruments used in this study were translated from the English into Korean may also be a possible limitation to its ultimate reliability. Even though this was done in a careful manner, following procedures outlined by Brislin, it is possible some misunderstanding on the part of the participants in completing the surveys could have taken place.

The use of self-reporting to obtain classroom achievement data may have some limitations, as students sometimes do not remember accurately or are reluctant to reveal their true scores, even in an anonymous reporting situation.

The fact that the schools used in this study are located in Seoul may have influence on the results of this study, as it may be anticipated that the use of schools in rural areas outside of Seoul could possibly produce quite different outcomes. Also, if data were collected in upper class area, such as the Kangnam section of Seoul, results

may be different as these students motivational patterns may be more influenced by western values.

One of the initial assumptions of this study was that Korean students' apparent high educational motivation may be accounted for by their Confucian heritage. However, as the results of this study indicate, motivational patterns of these Korean students are very similar with their counterparts in the United States and Canada, where such Confucian values are not evident. This apparent ambiguity may be explained by the consideration that the type of motivational *pattern* is not impacted so much by heritage factors, but the influence of these heritage factors is more directly related to the *intensity* of the motivation. While not a part of this study, Korean students have exhibited high motivational intensity for learning, both anecdotally and empirically, as indicated in Chapter 1. This seeming divergence of socio-cultural influences on motivational patterns and motivational intensity would need to be confirmed by further research.

Finally, a study of Korea alone cannot be considered representative of all collectivist-oriented environments around the globe. While this study might indicate that the principles of SDT may show some aspects of universality, many other cross-national studies, such as the one done by Chirkov, Ryan, Kim, and Kaplan (2000), would have to be undertaken to confirm or not confirm the appropriateness of SDT to explain educational motivation in all contexts. There may be other categories of societies other than individualist or collectivist, or eastern or western, that could be explored.

Appendices

Appendix A: INFORMED CONSENT

Title of Study: ***Self-Determination Theory in a Collectivist Educational Context: Motivation of Korean Students Learning English as a Foreign Language (EFL)***

Your child is invited to participate in a study examining Korean middle school students' motivation patterns and their perceptions of parental support for their autonomy. This study utilizes three research instruments, Self-Regulation Questionnaire-Academic (SRQ-A), Perceptions of Parents Scales (POPS), and Self-Report of Classroom Achievement in English Questionnaire. The SRQ-A is for finding out students' motivational patterns, and will ask students about their motivation to study English. For example, *why do I do English homework? or why do I work on my English class work?* POPS is for finding out how these students perceive their parents involvement and support for their autonomy. In other words, POPS will ask students about their parents. For example, *some mothers / some fathers always have the time to talk about their children's problem*. The third questionnaire will ask students their age, gender, persistence in studying English, mid-term score, and their expectancy in mastering English.

My name is Bokyung Murray, and I am a doctoral student at The University of Texas at Austin, Department of Foreign Language Education. This study relates to my doctoral dissertation. I am asking for permission to include your child in this study because subjects of this study are Korean middle school students studying English. I expect to have approximately 200 participants in this study.

If you allow your child to participate, I will be the principal investigator and will ask students to complete three survey questionnaires. Students will not be asked to provide any identifying information such as their names or class numbers. It is anticipated that the survey will be conducted during the regular English class time, and it should take approximately 20 minutes. The students who do not participate in this survey will be given a separate study assignment by the teacher.

The benefits of participation in this study are that your child will be contributing to a greater understanding for the pattern of motivation of Korean middle school students and of their perception of parental support. The risks of participation in this study are that your child might be uncomfortable answering some of the questions asked. Your child is encouraged to discuss this with me. I will explain the questions to them in more detail.

Any information that is obtained in connection with this study and that can be identified with your child will remain confidential and will be disclosed only with your permission. Students will only be asked to provide their age and gender. Their responses will not be linked to their name or your name in any written or verbal report of this research project.

Your decision to allow your child to participate will not affect your or his or her present of future relationship with The University of Texas at Austin or with their own school. If you have any questions about the study, please ask me. If you have any questions later, call me at (031) 902-9660. If you have any questions or concerns about your child's participation in this study, you may reach Professor Clarke Burnham, Chair of the University of Texas at Austin Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Research Participations at burnham@psy.utexas.edu

You may keep a copy of this consent form.

You are making a decision about allowing your child to participate in this study. Your signature below indicates that you have read the information provided above and have decided to allow him or her to participate in the study. If you later decide that you wish to withdraw your permission for your child to participate in the study, simply tell me. You may discontinue his or her participation at any time.

_____
Printed Name of Child

_____ _____
Signature of Parents or Legal Guardian Date

_____ _____
Signature of Investigator Date

I have read the description of the study titled *Self-Determination Theory in a Collectivist Educational Context: Motivation of Korean Students Learning English as a Foreign Language (EFL)* that is printed above, and I understand what the procedures are and what will happen to me in the study. I have received permission from my parents to participate in the study, and I agree to participate in it. I know that I can quit the study at any time.

_____ _____
Signature of Minor Date

Appendix B: 동 의 서

Title of Study: ***Self-Determination Theory in a Collectivist Educational Context: Motivation of Korean Students Learning English as a Foreign Language (EFL)***

한국 중학생의 학습동기 유형과 자신들의 자율성에 대한 부모의 뒷받침을 어떻게 인지하고 있나를 알아보고자 하는 연구에 당신의 자녀가 초대되었습니다. 이연구를 위하여, Self-Regulation Questionnaire-Academic (SRQ-A), Perceptions of Parents Scales (POPS), Self-Report of Classroom Achievement in English Questionnaire 라는 세개의 설문지가 사용됩니다. SRQ-A 는 학생들의 학습동기유형을 알아보고자 하는 것이어서, 학생들에게 영어를 공부하는 동기를 묻게됩니다. 예를 들면, "나는 왜 영어 숙제를 하는가?" 또는 "나는 왜 영어 시간에 열심히 하는가?" 등입니다. POPS 는 자신들의 자율성을 부모가 얼마나 뒷받침 하고 관여하는가에 대한 학생자신의 생각을 알아보고자 하는 것이고, 다시말하면, POPS 는 학생들에게 그들의 부모에 대해서 물어볼 것입니다. 예를들면, "어머니는 / 아버지는 자녀의 문제에 대해 대화할 시간이 항상 있다." 와 같은 사항들을 물어볼 것입니다. 세번째 설문지는 학생의 나이, 성별, 영어 공부에 할애하는 시간, 중간고사 영어점수, 그리고 영어를 마스터 할 수 있다고 학생들이 기대하는가에 대한 질문들로 구성되어 있습니다.

제 이름은 Bokyung Murray 이고, 저는 미국 Austin 에 있는 Texas 대학의 외국어 교육과에서 박사과정을 밟고 있습니다. 이 연구는 제 박사학위 논문과 관련이 있으며, 제 연구의 대상이 한국에서 영어를 공부하고있는 중학생이기 때문에, 당신의 자녀가 제 연구에 참여할 수 있도록 허가해 주시길 바랍니다. 저는 이 연구에 약 200 여명의 학생이 참가하기를 기대하고 있습니다.

만약 당신의 자녀가 이 연구에 참여할 수 있도록 허락하신다면, 제가 이 설문지 조사를 직접 이행할 것이며, 학생들에게는 세 개의 설문지에 응답하도록 할 것입니다. 학생들에게는 그들이 누구인지 알아볼 수 있는 이름이나, 번호등을 기재하도록 요구하지 않으며, 설문지 조사는 영어 수업시간에 이루어질 것입니다. 그리고 소요되는 시간은 약 20 분 정도로 예상합니다. 설문지 조사에 참여하지않는 학생은 담당 선생님께서 정해주시는 공부를 하게될 것 입니다.

이 연구에 동참함으로써 좋은점은, 한국 중학생의 학습동기 유형과 부모의 뒷받침에 대한 그들의 인지도를 더 잘 이해하는데 당신의 자녀가 기여 한다는 데 있고, 좋지 않은점은 어떤 질문에 대해 약간 불편을 느낄지도 모른다는 점입니다. 이 점에 대해서는 저와 대화 하도록 할 것이며, 저는 학생들에게 더 자세히 그러한 질문에 대해 설명하도록 하겠습니다.

이설문지를 통해 얻게되는 당신 자녀에대한 어떠한 정보도 비밀로 남겨질 것이며 당신의 요구시에만 열어볼 수 있게됩니다. 학생들에게는 그들의 나이과 성별만을 물어볼 것이며, 그들이 답한 설문지는 그들의 이름이나 부모님 이름과는 서면으로나 구두로나 절대로 연결되지 않을 것입니다.

당신의 자녀가 참여하도록 허락하는 일은 당신이나 당신 자녀의 현재나 혹은 미래에도 그들의 학교나 Austin 에 있는 Texas 대학의 관계에 절대로 어떤 영향을 미치지

않습니다. 이 연구에대해 질문이 있으시다면, 저에게 물어보십시오. 혹, 나중에 질문이 생긴다면, (031) 902-9660으로 연락하시고, 또는 Clarke Burnham 교수님께 물어보실 수 있습니다. Prof. Clarke Burnham 은 Chair of the University of Texas at Austin Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Research Participations 이시며, 그의 메일 주소는 burnham@psy.utexas.edu 입니다.

이 동의서의 사본을 가지셔도 좋습니다.

이제 당신의 자녀가 이 연구에 참여할지를 결정해 주십시오. 위의 설명들을 다 읽으시고 당신의 자녀가 이 연구에 참여하도록 허락하신다면, 아래에 사인을 해 주십시오. 만약 나중에라도, 당신의 허락을 철회하고 싶다면, 저에게 말하세요. 어느때건 상관없이 당신 자녀의 참여를 멈추실 수 있습니다.

_____
학생 이름란

_____ _____
부모님이나 보호자 서명란 날짜

_____ _____
연구 서명란 날짜

저는 *Self-Determination Theory in a Collectivist Educational Context: Motivation of Korean Students Learning English as a Foreign Language (EFL)* 라는 연구에 대한 설명을 다 읽었으며, 그 절차와 이 연구에서 제가 어떤일을 해야하는지 이해했습니다. 이 연구에 참여해도 좋다는 부모님의 허락을 받았으며, 저도 참여하기를 바랍니다. 그리고 언제든지 그만 둘 수 있다는 것도 알고 있습니다.

_____ _____
학생 서명란 날짜

Appendix C: Self-Regulation Questionnaire-Academic (SRQ-A)

There are four major sections (A, B, C, D), and each section contains eight responses. Please read carefully, and circle the number of responses which describes you the closest.

A. Why do I do my English homework?

1. Because I want the teacher to think I'm a good student.

   (1)Very true (2) Sort of true (3) Not very true (4) Not at all true

2. Because I'll get in trouble if I don't do my English homework.

   (1) Very true (2) Sort of true (3) Not very true (4) Not at all true

3. Because it's fun to do my English homework.

   (1) Very true (2) Sort of true (3) Not very true (4) Not at all true

4. Because I will feel bad about myself if I don't do my English homework.

   (1) Very true (2) Sort of true (3) Not very true (4) Not at all true

5. Because I want to understand English.

   (1) Very true (2) Sort of true (3) Not very true (4) Not at all true

6. Because that's what I'm supposed to do my English homework.

   (1) Very true (2) Sort of true (3) Not very true (4) Not at all true

7. Because I enjoy doing my English homework.

   (1) Very true (2) Sort of true (3) Not very true (4) Not at all true

8. Because it's important to me to do my English homework.

   (1) Very true (2) Sort of true (3) Not very true (4) Not at all true

B. Why do I work on my English classwork?

9. So that the teacher won't yell at me.

(1) Very true (2) Sort of true (3) Not very true (4) Not at all true

10. Because I want the teacher to think I'm a good student.

(1) Very true (2) Sort of true (3) Not very true (4) Not at all true

11. Because I want to learn new things.

(1) Very true (2) Sort of true (3) Not very true (4) Not at all true

12. Because I'll be ashamed of myself if it didn't get done.

(1) Very true (2) Sort of true (3) Not very true (4) Not at all true

13. Because it's fun to work on English classwork.

(1) Very true (2) Sort of true (3) Not very true (4) Not at all true

14. Because that's the rule.

(1) Very true (2) Sort of true (3) Not very true (4) Not at all true

15. Because I enjoy doing my English classwork.

(1) Very true (2) Sort of true (3) Not very true (4) Not at all true

16. Because it's important to me to work on my English classwork.

(1) Very true (2) Sort of true (3) Not very true (4) Not at all true

C. Why do I try to answer hard questions in English class?

17. Because I want the other students to think I'm smart.

(1) Very true (2) Sort of true (3) Not very true (4) Not at all true

18. Because I feel ashamed of myself when I don't try.

(1) Very true (2) Sort of true (3) Not very true (4) Not at all true

19. Because I enjoy answering hard questions.

(1) Very true (2) Sort of true (3) Not very true (4) Not at all true

20. Because that's what I'm supposed to do.

(1) Very true (2) Sort of true (3) Not very true (4) Not at all true

21. To find out if I'm right or wrong.

(1) Very true (2) Sort of true (3) Not very true (4) Not at all true

22. Because it's fun to answer hard questions.

(1) Very true (2) Sort of true (3) Not very true (4) Not at all true

23. Because it's important to me to try to answer hard questions in English class.

(1) Very true (2) Sort of true (3) Not very true (4) Not at all true

24. Because I want my English teacher to say nice things about me.

(1) Very true (2) Sort of true (3) Not very true (4) Not at all true

D. Why do I try to do well in English?

25. Because that's what I'm supposed to do.

(1) Very true (2) Sort of true (3) Not very true (4) Not at all true

26. So my English teacher will think I'm a good student.

(1) Very true (2) Sort of true (3) Not very true (4) Not at all true

27. Because I enjoy doing my English well.

(1) Very true (2) Sort of true (3) Not very true (4) Not at all true

28. Because I will get in trouble if I don't do well.

(1) Very true (2) Sort of true (3) Not very true (4) Not at all true

29. Because I'll feel really bad about myself if I don't do well.

(1) Very true (2) Sort of true (3) Not very true (4) Not at all true

30. Because it's important to me to try to do well in English.

(1) Very true (2) Sort of true (3) Not very true (4) Not at all true

31. Because I will feel really proud of myself if I do well.

(1) Very true (2) Sort of true (3) Not very true (4) Not at all true

32. Because I might get a reward if I do well.

(1) Very true (2) Sort of true (3) Not very true (4) Not at all true

33. Because I would like to please my parents and my family members.

(1) Very true (2) Sort of true (3) Not very true (4) Not at all true

Appendix D: Self-Regulation Questionnaire-Academic (SRQ-A) (Korean Version)

다음 네개의 큰 질문 (A, B, C, D)이 있고, 그에 따른 응답이 각각 여덟 문항이 있습니다. 각 응답들을 잘 읽고, 자신의 행동과 맞다고 생각되는 번호에 동그라미를 하세요.

A. 나는 왜 영어 숙제를 하는가?

1. 선생님이 나를 좋은 학생이라고 생각해주길 원하기 때문에.

   (1) 매우 그렇다 (2) 약간 그렇다 (3) 별로 그렇지 않다 (4) 전혀 그렇지 않다

2. 만약 영어 숙제를 하지 않으면 곤란해지기 때문에.

   (1) 매우 그렇다 (2) 약간 그렇다 (3) 별로 그렇지 않다 (4) 전혀 그렇지 않다

3. 영어숙제가 재미 있어서.

   (1) 매우 그렇다 (2) 약간 그렇다 (3) 별로 그렇지 않다 (4) 전혀 그렇지 않다

4. 만약 영어숙제를 하지 않으면, 내 자신에대해 기분이 나쁠테니까.

   (1) 매우 그렇다 (2) 약간 그렇다 (3) 별로 그렇지 않다 (4) 전혀 그렇지 않다

5. 영어를 이해하고 싶어서.

   (1) 매우 그렇다 (2) 약간 그렇다 (3) 별로 그렇지 않다 (4) 전혀 그렇지 않다

6. 영어숙제는 내가 해야 하는 일이니까.

   (1) 매우 그렇다 (2) 약간 그렇다 (3) 별로 그렇지 않다 (4) 전혀 그렇지 않다

7. 영어숙제하는 일이 즐겁기 때문에.

   (1) 매우 그렇다 (2) 약간 그렇다 (3) 별로 그렇지 않다 (4) 전혀 그렇지 않다

8. 영어숙제는 나에게 중요한 일이니까.

   (1) 매우 그렇다 (2) 약간 그렇다 (3) 별로 그렇지 않다 (4) 전혀 그렇지 않다

B. 나는 왜 영어시간에 열심히 하는가?

9. 선생님이 나에게 소리를 지르시지 않도록 하기위해서.

(1) 매우 그렇다 (2) 약간 그렇다 (3) 별로 그렇지 않다 (4) 전혀 그렇지 않다

10. 선생님이 나를 좋은 학생이라고 생각해 주길 원해서.

(1) 매우 그렇다 (2) 약간 그렇다 (3) 별로 그렇지 않다 (4) 전혀 그렇지 않다

11. 새로운 여러가지 것 들을 배우고 싶어서.

(1) 매우 그렇다 (2) 약간 그렇다 (3) 별로 그렇지 않다 (4) 전혀 그렇지 않다

12. 영어시간에 열심히 하지 않으면, 내 자신에게 부끄럽기 때문에.

(1) 매우 그렇다 (2) 약간 그렇다 (3) 별로 그렇지 않다 (4) 전혀 그렇지 않다

13. 영어가 재미있으니까.

(1) 매우 그렇다 (2) 약간 그렇다 (3) 별로 그렇지 않다 (4) 전혀 그렇지 않다

14. 영어시간에 열심히 하는 것은 바로 규칙이기 때문에.

(1) 매우 그렇다 (2) 약간 그렇다 (3) 별로 그렇지 않다 (4) 전혀 그렇지 않다

15. 영어시간에 열심히 하는 것이 재미있기 때문에.

(1) 매우 그렇다 (2) 약간 그렇다 (3) 별로 그렇지 않다 (4) 전혀 그렇지 않다

16. 영어시간에 열심히 하는 것은 나에게 중요하기 때문에.

(1) 매우 그렇다 (2) 약간 그렇다 (3) 별로 그렇지 않다 (4) 전혀 그렇지 않다

C. 왜 나는 영어시간에 어려운 질문에 답하려고 노력하는가?

17. 다른 친구들이 나를 똑똑하다고 생각해주길 원해서.

(1) 매우 그렇다 (2) 약간 그렇다 (3) 별로 그렇지 않다 (4) 전혀 그렇지 않다

18. 그렇지 않으면, 내 자신에게 부끄러울테니까.

(1) 매우 그렇다 (2) 약간 그렇다 (3) 별로 그렇지 않다 (4) 전혀 그렇지 않다

19. 영어시간에 어려운 질문에 대답하는 일이 재미있어서.

(1) 매우 그렇다 (2) 약간 그렇다 (3) 별로 그렇지 않다 (4) 전혀 그렇지 않다

20. 어려운 질문에 대답하는 것은 당연히 내가 해야하는 일이니까.

(1) 매우 그렇다 (2) 약간 그렇다 (3) 별로 그렇지 않다 (4) 전혀 그렇지 않다

21. 내가 맞는지 틀리는지 알고 싶어서.

(1) 매우 그렇다 (2) 약간 그렇다 (3) 별로 그렇지 않다 (4) 전혀 그렇지 않다

22. 어려운 질문에 대답하는 것이 즐겁기 때문에.

(1) 매우 그렇다 (2) 약간 그렇다 (3) 별로 그렇지 않다 (4) 전혀 그렇지 않다

23. 영어시간에 어려운 질문에 대답하는 일은 나에게 중요한 일이니까.

(1) 매우 그렇다 (2) 약간 그렇다 (3) 별로 그렇지 않다 (4) 전혀 그렇지 않다

24. 선생님께 칭찬을 듣고 싶어서.

(1) 매우 그렇다 (2) 약간 그렇다 (3) 별로 그렇지 않다 (4) 전혀 그렇지 않다

D. 나는 왜 영어공부를 잘 하려고 노력하는가?

25. 영어공부를 잘 하는 것은 내가 해야하는 일이니까.

(1) 매우 그렇다 (2) 약간 그렇다 (3) 별로 그렇지 않다 (4) 전혀 그렇지 않다

26. 영어 선생님께서 나를 좋은 학생이라고 생각하실 테니까.

(1) 매우 그렇다 (2) 약간 그렇다 (3) 별로 그렇지 않다 (4) 전혀 그렇지 않다

27. 영어공부를 잘 하는 것이 즐겁기 때문에.

(1) 매우 그렇다 (2) 약간 그렇다 (3) 별로 그렇지 않다 (4) 전혀 그렇지 않다

28. 만약 영어를 잘 못하면, 내가 나중에 곤란해질 테니까.

(1) 매우 그렇다 (2) 약간 그렇다 (3) 별로 그렇지 않다 (4) 전혀 그렇지 않다

29. 만약 영어를 잘 못하면, 내 자신에대해 정말 부끄러울 테니까.

(1) 매우 그렇다 (2) 약간 그렇다 (3) 별로 그렇지 않다 (4) 전혀 그렇지 않다

30. 영어를 잘 하려고 노력하는 것은 나에게 중요한 일이니까.

(1) 매우 그렇다 (2) 약간 그렇다 (3) 별로 그렇지 않다 (4) 전혀 그렇지 않다

31. 영어를 잘 하면, 내 자신이 무척 자랑스러울 테니까.

(1) 매우 그렇다 (2) 약간 그렇다 (3) 별로 그렇지 않다 (4) 전혀 그렇지 않다

32. 영어를 잘 하면, 보상을 받을지도 모르기 때문에.

(1) 매우 그렇다 (2) 약간 그렇다 (3) 별로 그렇지 않다 (4) 전혀 그렇지 않다

33. 영어를 잘 해서, 부모님과 식구들을 기쁘게 해드리고 싶어서.

(1) 매우 그렇다 (2) 약간 그렇다 (3) 별로 그렇지 않다 (4) 전혀 그렇지 않다

Appendix E: Perceptions of Parents Scales (POPS)

This survey concerns your parents. Please read carefully, and circle the number which describes your parents the closest. Mother descriptions are items 1 to 11, and father descriptions are items 12 to 22.

1. (1) Some mothers **never have enough time** to talk to their children.
   (2) Some mothers **usually don't have enough time** to talk to their children.
   (3) Some mothers **sometimes have enough time** to talk to their children.
   (4) Some mothers **always have enough time** to talk to their children.

2. (1) Some mothers **always explain** to their children about the way they should behave.
   (2) Some mothers **sometimes explain** to their children about the way they should behave.
   (3) Some mothers **sometimes make** their children behave because they're the boss.
   (4) Some mothers **always make** their children behave because they're the boss.

3. (1) Some mothers **always ask** their children what they did in school that day.
   (2) Some mothers **usually ask** their children what they did in school that day.
   (3) Some mothers **usually don't ask** their children what they did in school that day.
   (4) Some mothers **never ask** their children what they did in school that day.

4. (1) Some mothers **always get very upset** if their children don't do what they're supposed to right away.
   (2) Some mothers **sometimes get very upset** if their children don't do what they're supposed to right away.
   (3) Some mothers **sometimes try to understand** why their children don't do what they're supposed to right away.
   (4) Some mothers **always try to understand** why their children don't do what they're supposed to right away.

5. (1) Some mothers **always have the time to talk** about their children's problem.
   (2) Some mothers **sometimes have the time to talk** about their children's problem.
   (3) Some mothers **don't always have the time to talk** about their children's problem.
   (4) Some mothers **never have the time to talk** about their children's problem.

6. (1) Some mothers **never punish** their children; they **always talk** to their children about what was wrong.
   (2) Some mothers **hardly ever punish** their children; they **usually talk** to their children about what was wrong.
   (3) Some mothers **usually punish** their children when they've done something wrong

without talking to them very much.
(4) Some mothers **always punish** their children when they've done something wrong **without talking to them at all**.

7. (1) Some mothers **always tell** their children what to do.
(2) Some mothers **sometimes tell** their children what to do.
(3) Some mothers **sometimes** like their children to **decide for themselves what to do**.
(4) Some mothers **always** like their children to **decide for themselves what to do**.

8. (1) Some mothers **always think it' OK** if their children make mistakes.
(2) Some mothers **sometimes think it's OK** if their children make mistakes.
(3) Some mothers **sometimes get angry** if their children make mistakes.
(4) Some mothers **always get angry** if their children make mistakes.

9. (1) Some mothers **never want to know** what their children are doing.
(2) Some mothers **usually don't want to know** what their children are doing.
(3) Some mothers **sometimes want to know** what their children are doing.
(4) Some mothers **always want to know** what their children are doing.

10. (1) Some mothers **always get upset** when their children don't do well in school.
(2) Some mothers **sometimes get upset** when their children don't do well in school.
(3) Some mothers **hardly ever get upset** when their children don't do well in school.
(4) Some mothers **never get upset** when their children don't do well in school.

11. (1) Some mothers **always like to talk to their children's teachers** about how they are doing in school.
(2) Some mothers **sometimes like to talk to their children's teachers** about how they are doing in school.
(3) Some mothers **usually don't like to talk to their children's teachers** about how they are doing in school.
(4) Some mothers **never like to talk to their children's teachers** about how they are doing in school.

The following 11 questions are about your father.

12. (1) Some fathers never **have enough time** to talk to their children.
(2) Some fathers **usually don't have enough time** to talk to their children.
(3) Some fathers **sometimes have enough time** to talk to their children.
(4) Some fathers **always have enough time** to talk to their children.

13. (1) Some fathers **always explain** to their children about the way they should behave.
    (2) Some fathers **sometimes explain** to their children about the way they should behave.
    (3) Some fathers **sometimes make** their children behave because they're the boss.
    (4) Some fathers **always make** their children behave because they're the boss.

14. (1) Some fathers **always ask** their children what they did in school that day.
    (2) Some fathers **usually ask** their children what they did in school that day.
    (3) Some fathers **usually don't ask** their children what they did in school that day.
    (4) Some fathers **never ask** their children what they did in school that day.

15. (1) Some fathers **always get very upset** if their children don't do what they're supposed to right away.
    (2) Some fathers **sometimes get very upset** if their children don't do what they're supposed to right away.
    (3) Some fathers **sometimes try to understand** why their children don't do what they're supposed to right away.
    (4) Some fathers **always try to understand** what their children don't do what they're supposed to right away.

16. (1) Some fathers **always have the time to talk** about their children's problem.
    (2) Some fathers **sometimes have the time to talk** about their children's problem.
    (3) Some fathers **don't always have the time to talk** about their children's problem.
    (4) Some fathers **never have the time to talk** about their children's problem.

17. (1) Some fathers **never punish** their children; they **always talk** to their children about what was wrong.
    (2) Some fathers **hardly ever punish** their children; they **usually talk** to their children about what was wrong.
    (3) Some fathers **usually punish** their children when they've done something wrong **without talking to them very much**.
    (4) Some fathers **always punish** their children when they've done something wrong **without talking to them at all**.

18. (1) Some fathers **always tell** their children what to do.
    (2) Some fathers **sometimes tell** their children what to do.
    (3) Some fathers sometimes like their children to **decide for themselves** what to do.
    (4) Some fathers **always** like their children to **decide for themselves** what to do.

19. (1) Some fathers **always think it's OK** if their children make mistakes.
    (2) Some fathers **sometimes think it's OK** if their children make mistakes.
    (3) Some fathers **sometimes get angry** if their children make mistakes.
    (4) Some fathers **always get angry** if their children make mistakes.

20. (1) Some fathers **never want to know** what their children are doing.
    (2) Some fathers **usually don't want to know** what their children are doing.
    (3) Some fathers **sometimes want to know** what their children are doing.
    (4) Some fathers **always want to know** what their children are doing.

21. (1) Some fathers **always get upset** when their children don't do well in school.
    (2) Some fathers **sometimes get upset** when their children don't do well in school.
    (3) Some fathers **hardly ever get upset** when their children don't do well in school
    (4) Some fathers **never get upset** when their children don't do well in school.

22. (1) Some fathers **always like to talk to their children's teachers** about how they are doing in school.
    (2) Some fathers **sometimes like to talk to their children's teachers** about how they are doing in school.
    (3) Some fathers **usually don't like to talk to their children's teachers** about how they are doing in school.
    (4) Some fathers **never like to talk to their children's teachers** about how they are doing in school.

Appendix F: Perceptions of Parents Scales (POPS) (Korean Version)

이 설문지는 여러분의 부모님에 대한 설명들입니다. 다음 각 문항의 보기들을 잘 읽고 자신의 어머니와 아버지를 가장 잘 설명하고 있다고 생각되는 번호에 동그라미를 하세요. 어머니에 대한 설명은 1-11번 문항이고, 아버지에 대한 설명은 12-22번 문항입니다.

1. (1) 어머니는 자녀와 대화할 시간이 전혀 없다.
   (2) 어머니는 자녀와 대화할 시간이 보통은 없다.
   (3) 어머니는 자녀와 대화할 시간이 가끔있다.
   (4) 어머니는 자녀와 대화할 시간이 항상있다.

2. (1) 어머니는 자녀에게 어떻게 행동해야하는지르 항상 설명해 주신다.
   (2) 어머니는 자녀에게 어떻게 행동해야하는지를 가끔 설명해 주신다.
   (3) 어머니는 윗어른이시기 때문에 자녀가 옳바르게 행동하도록 가끔 명령하신다.
   (4) 어머니는 윗어른이시기 때문에 자녀가 옳바르게 행동하도록 항상 명령하신다.

3. (1) 어머니는 자녀에게 그날 학교에서 무엇을 했는지 항상 물어보신다.
   (2) 어머니는 자녀에게 그날 학교에서 무엇을 했는지 보통은 물어보신다.
   (3) 어머니는 자녀에게 그날 학교에서 무엇을 했는지 보통 묻지 않으신다.
   (4) 어머니는 자녀에게 그날 학교에서 무엇을 했는지 전혀 묻지 않으신다.

4. (1) 어머니는 자녀가 해야할 일을 제대로 하지 않으면 항상 화를 내신다.
   (2) 어머니는 자녀가 해야할 일을 제대로 하지 않으면 가끔 화를 내신다.
   (3) 어머니는 자녀가 해야할 일을 제대로 하지 않는 이유를 가끔 이해하시려고 하신다.
   (4) 어머니는 자녀가 해야할 일을 제대로 하지 않는 이유를 항상 이해하시려고 하신다.

5. (1) 어머니는 자녀의 문제에대해 대화할 시간이 항상 있다.
   (2) 어머니는 자녀의 문제에대해 대화할 시간이 가끔은 있다.
   (3) 어머니는 자녀의 문제에대해 대화할 시간이 항상 있지는 않다.
   (4) 어머니는 자녀의 문제에대해 대화할 시간이 전혀 없다.

6. (1) 어머니는 자녀에게 절대로 벌을 주지 않는다. 어머니는 문제가 무엇인지에대해 항상 자녀와 대화한다.
   (2) 어머니는 자녀에게 거의 벌을 주지 않는다. 어머니는 문제가 무엇인지에대해 보통은 자녀와 대화한다.
   (3) 어머니는 자녀가 잘못을 했을때 자녀와 충분한 대화도 하지않고 보통은 벌을 주신다.

(4) 어머니는 자녀가 잘못을 했을때 자녀와 전혀 대화하지않고 항상 벌을 주신다.

7. (1) 어머니는 자녀에게 어떻게 행동해야하는지를 항상 말씀하신다.
(2) 어머니는 자녀에게 어 떻게 행동해야하는지를 가끔 말씀하신다.
(3) 어머니는 자녀가 자신의 행동을 스스로 결정하기를 가끔 좋아하신다.
(4) 어머니느 자녀가 자신의 행동을 스스로 결정하기를 항상 좋아하신다.

8. (1) 어머니는 자녀가 실수를 해도 항상 괜찮다고 생각하신다.
(2) 어머니는 자녀가 실수를 해도 가끔은 괜찮다고 생각하신다.
(3) 어머니는 자녀가 실수를 하면 가끔 화를 내신다.
(4) 어머니는 자녀가 실수를 하면 항상 화를 내신다.

9. (1) 어머니는 자녀가 무엇을 하는지 전혀 알고 싶어하지 않으신다.
(2) 어머니는 자녀가 무엇을 하는지 보통은 알고 싶어하지 않으신다.
(3) 어머니는 자녀가 무엇을 하는지 가끔은 알고 싶어하신다.
(4) 어머니는 자녀가 무엇을 하는지 항상 알고 싶어하신다.

10. (1) 어머니는 자녀가 학교에서 잘 하지 못하면 항상 화를 내신다.
(2) 어머니는 자녀가 학교에서 잘 하지 못하면 가끔 화를 내신다.
(3) 어머니는 자녀가 학교에서 잘 하지 못해도 거의 화를 내지 않으신다.
(4) 어머니는 자녀가 학교에서 잘 하지 못해도 전혀 화를 내지 않으신다.

11. (1) 어머니는 자녀가 학교에서 어떻게 지내는지에대해 선생님과 대화 하기를 항상 좋아하신다.
(2) 어머니는 자녀가 학교에서 어떻게 지내는지에대해 선생님과 대화하기를 가끔은 좋아하신다.
(3) 어머니는 자녀가 학교에서 어떻게 지내는지에대해 선생님과 대화하기를 보통은 좋아하지 않으신다.
(4) 어머니는 자녀가 학교에서 어떻게 지내는지에대해 선생님과 대화하기를 전혀 좋아하지 않으신다.

다음 12번 부터는 여러분의 아버지에 대한 설명입니다. 보기를 잘 읽고 자신의 아버지의 설명과 가장 비슷한 번호에 동그라미를 하세요.

12. (1) 아버지는 자녀와 대화할 시간이 전혀 없다.
(2) 아버지는 자녀와 대화할 시간이 보통은 없다.
(3) 아버지는 자녀와 대화할 시간이 가끔있다.
(4) 아버지는 자녀와 대화할 시간이 항상있다.

13. (1) 아버지는 자녀에게 어떻게 행동해야하는지를 항상 설명해 주신다.
(2) 아버지는 자녀에게 어떻게 행동해야하는지를 가끔 설명해 주신다.
(3) 아버지는 윗어른이시기 때문에 자녀가 옳바르게 행동하도록 가끔 명령하신다.
(4) 아버지는 윗어른이시기 때문에 자녀가 옳바르게 행동하도록 항상 명령하신다.

14. (1) 아버지는 자녀에게 그날 학교에서 무엇을 했는지 항상 물어보신다.
(2) 아버지는 자녀에게 그날 학교에서 무엇을 했는지 보통은 물어보신다.
(3) 아버지는 자녀에게 그날 학교에서 무엇을 했는지 보통은 물어보지 않는다.
(4) 아버지는 자녀에게 그날 학교에서 무엇을 했는지 전혀 묻지 않으신다.

15. (1) 아버지는 자녀가 해야할 일을 제대로 하지 않으면 항상 화를 내신다.
(2) 아버지는 자녀가 해야할 일을 제대로 하지 않으면 가끔 화를 내신다.
(3) 아버지는 자녀가 해야할 일을 제대로 하지 않는 이유를 가끔 이해하시려고 하신다.
(4) 아버지는 자녀가 해야할 일을 제대로 하지 않는 이유를 항상 이해하시려고 하신다.

16. (1) 아버지는 자녀의 문제에 대해 대화할 시간이 항상 있다.
(2) 아버지는 자녀의 문제에 대해 대화할 시간이 가끔은 있다.
(3) 아버지는 자녀의 문제에 대해 대화할 시간이 항상 있지는 않다.
(4) 아버지는 자녀의 문제에 대해 대화할 시간이 전혀 없다.

17. (1) 아버지는 자녀에게 절대로 벌을 주지 않는다. 아버지는 문제가 무엇인지에 대해 항상 자녀와 대화한다.
(2) 아버지는 자녀에게 거의 벌을 주지 않는다. 아버지는 문제가 무엇인지에 대해 보통은 자녀와 대화한다.
(3) 아버지는 자녀가 잘못을 했을때 자녀와 충분한 대화도 하지 않고 보통은 벌을 주신다.
(4) 아버지는 자녀가 잘못을 했을때 자녀와 전혀 대화하지 않고 항상 벌을 주신다.

18. (1) 아버지는 자녀에게 어떻게 행동해야하는지를 항상 말씀하신다.
(2) 아버지는 자녀에게 어떻게 행동해야하는지를 가끔 말씀하신다.
(3) 아버지는 자녀가 자신의 행동을 스스로 결정하기를 가끔 좋아하신다.
(4) 아버지는 자녀가 자신의 행동을 스스로 결정하기를 항상 좋아하신다.

19. (1) 아버지는 자녀가 실수를 해도 항상 괜찮다고 생각하신다.
(2) 아버지는 자녀가 실수를 해도 가끔은 괜찮다고 생각하신다.
(3) 아버지는 자녀가 실수를 하면 가끔 화를 내신다.
(4) 아버지는 자녀가 실수를 하면 항상 화를 내신다.

20. (1) 아버지는 자녀가 무엇을 하는지 전혀 알고 싶어하지 않으신다.
(2) 아버지는 자녀가 무엇을 하는지 보통은 알고 싶어하지 않으신다.
(3) 아버지는 자녀가 무엇을 하는지 가끔은 알고 싶어하신다.
(4) 아버지는 자녀가 무엇을 하는지 항상 알고 싶어하신다.

21. (1) 아버지는 자녀가 학교에서 잘 하지 못하면 항상 화를 내신다.
(2) 아버지는 자녀가 학교에서 잘 하지 못하면 가끔 화를 내신다.
(3) 아버지는 자녀가 학교에서 잘 하지 못해도 거의 화를 내지 않으신다.

(4) 아버지는 자녀가 학교에서 잘 하지 못해도 전혀 화를 내지 않으신다.

22. (1) 아버지는 자녀가 학교에서 어떻게 지내는지에대해 선생님과 대화하기를 항상 좋아하신다.
(2) 아버지는 자녀가 학교에서 어떻게 지내는지에대해 선생님과 대화하기를 가끔 좋아하신다.
(3) 아버지는 자녀가 학교에서 어떻게 지내는지에대해 선생님과 대화하기를 보통은 좋아하지 않으신다.
(4) 아버니는 자녀가 학교에서 어떻게 지내는지에대해 선생님과 대화하기를 전혀 좋아하지 않으신다.

Appendix G: Self-Report of Classroom Achievement in English Questionnaire

1. Age: _____ Years Old
2. Gender: ( ) Boy, ( ) Girl
3. I spend the following amount of time to study English after class every day:

   (1) None (2) 30 minutes – 1 hour (3) 1 hour – 2 hours (4) More than 2 hours
4. My mid-term score in English is:

   _____
5. I feel confident that I will become proficient in English in the future.

   (1) Not at all true (2) Not very true (3) Sort of true (4) Very true

Appendix H: Self-Report of Classroom Achievement in English Questionnaire (Korean Version)

1. 나이: _____ 세

2. 성별: ( ) 남, ( ) 여

3. 나는 방과후 매일 영어 공부에 다음과 같은 시간을 보낸다:

   (1) 전혀 하지 않는다 (2) 30분 -- 1시간 (3)1시간 - 2시간 (4) 2시간 이상

4. 나의 중간고사 영어성적은: _____ 점

5. 미래에는 내가 영어를 아주 잘 할 수 있을 거라고 나는 확신한다.

   (1) 전혀 아니다 (2) 별로 그렇지 않다 (3) 약간 그렇다 (4) 매우 그렇다

References

Ames, C. (1992). Classrooms, goals, structures and student motivation. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 84, 267-271.

Au, S. Y. (1988). A critical appraisal of Gardner's socio-psychological theory of second-language (L2) learning. *Language Learning*, 38, 75-100.

Ausubel, D.A. (1968). *Educational psychology: A cognitive view*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Bandura, A. (1993). Perceived self-efficacy in cognitive development and functioning. *Educational Psychologist*, 28, 117-148.

Belmechri, F., & Hymmel, K. (1998). Orientations and motivation in the acquisition of English as a second language among high school students in Quebec City, *Language Learning*, 48, 219-244.

Benson, P. (2001). *Teaching and researching autonomy in language learning*. New York: Longman.

Benson, P., Chik A., & Lim, H. (2003). Becoming autonomous in an Asian context: Autonomy as a sociocultural process. In D. Palfreyman, & R. C. Smith (Eds.), *Learner autonomy across cultures: Language education perspectives* (pp. 1-40). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Brislin, R. W. (1986). The wording and translation of research instruments. In W. J. Lonner, & J. W. Berry (Eds.), *Field methods in cross-cultural research* (pp. 137-164). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Brophy, J. (1999). Research on motivation in education: Past, present, and future. In T. C. Urdan (Ed.), *The role of context* (pp. 1-44). Stamford, CT: JAI Press.

Brown, H. D. (2000). *Principles of language learning and teaching (4th Edition).* White Plains, NY: Longman.

Brown, H. D. (2002). *Strategies for success: a practical guide to learning English*. New York: Longman.

Burstall, C., Jamieson, M., Cohen, S., & Hargreaves, M. (1974). *Primary French in the balance*. London: NFER Publishing.

Chirkov, V., Ryan, R. M., Kim, Y., & Kaplan, U. (2003). Differentiating autonomy from individualism and independence: A self-determination theory perspective on internalization of cultural orientations and well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84, 372-386.

Corder, S. P. (1981). *Error analysis and interlanguage*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Crookes, G., & Schmidt, R.W. (1991). Motivation: Reopening the research agenda. *Language Learning*, 41, 469-512.

Deci, E. L. (1971). Effects of externally motivated rewards on intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 18, 1055-115.

Deci, E. L. (1975). *Intrinsic motivation*. New York: Plenum.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York: Plenum.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. (Eds.). (2002). *Handbook of self-determination research*. Rochester, NY: The University of Rochester Press.

Deci, E. L., Vallerand, R. J., Pelletier, L. G., & Ryan, R. M. (1991). Motivation in education: The self-determination perspective. *Educational psychologist*, 26, 3-4, 325-346.

Dickinson, L. (1995). Autonomy and motivation: a literature review. *System*, 23, (2), 165-174.

Dörnyei, Z. (1990). Conceptualizing motivation in foreign language learning. *Language Learning*, 40, 46-78.

Dörnyei, Z. (1994). Understanding L2 motivation: On with the challenge! *Modern Language Journal*, 78, 515-523.

Dörnyei, Z. (1998). Motivation in second and foreign language learning. *Language Learning*, 31, 117-135.

Dörnyei, Z. (2001). *Teaching and researching motivation*. New York: Longman.

Dörnyei, Z. (2003). *Questionnaires in second language learning research: Construction, administration, and processing*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Dörnyei, Z., & Schmidt, R. (Eds.) (2001). *Motivation and second language acquisition.* Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i Press.

Dweck, C. S. (1999). *Self-theories: Their role in motivation, personality, and development*. Philadelphia, PA: Taylor & Francis.

Eccles, J., & Wigfield, A. (1995). In the mind of the actor: The structure of adolescents' achievement task values and expectance-related beliefs. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 21, 215-225.

Ehrman, M. E., & Dörnyei, Z. (1998). *Interpersonal dynamics in second language*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Fisher, C. D. (1978). The effects of personal control, competence, and extrinsic reward systems on intrinsic motivation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 21, 273-288*.

Gardner, R.C. (1985). *Social psychology and language learning: The role of attitudes and motivation*. London, Ontario: Edward Arnold.

Gardner, R.C. (1988). The socio-educational model of second-language learning: assumptions, findings, and issues. *Language Learning*, 38, 101-126.

Gardner, R. C., & Lambert, W. E. (1959). Motivational variables in second language acquisition. *Canadian Journal of Psychology*, 13,266-272.

Gardner, R. C., & Lambert, W. E. (1975). *Second language acquisition: A social-psychological approach* (Research Bulletin No. 332). London, Ontario: University of Western Ontario, Department of Psychology.

Gliksman, L., Gardner, R. C., & Smythe, P. C. (1982). The role of the integrative motive on students' participation in the French classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 38, 625-647.

Goodwin, C. J. (2002). *Research in psychology: Methods and design* (3rd edition). New York: John Wiley.

Greene, D., & Lepper, M. R. (1974). Effects of extrinsic rewards on children's subsequent intrinsic interest. *Child Development*, 45, 1141-1145.

Grolnick, W. S., & Ryan, R. M. (1987). Autonomy in children's learning: An experimental and individual difference investigation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 890-898.

Grolnick, W. S., Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (1991). The inner resources for school performance: Motivational mediators of children's perceptions of their parents. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 83, 508-517.

Grolnick, W. S., Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1997). Internalization within the family: The self-determination theory perspective. In J. E. Grusec, & L. Kuczynski (Eds.), *Parenting and children's internalization of values: A handbook of contemporary theory* (pp. 135-161). New York: John Wiley.

Harter, S. (1981). A new self-report scale of intrinsic versus extrinsic orientation in the classroom: Motivational and informational components. *Developmental Psychology*, 17, 300-312.

Harter, S., & Connell, J. P. (1984). A model on the relationship among children's academic achievement and their self-perceptions of competence, control, and motivational orientation. In J. Nicholls (Eds.), *The development of achievement motivation* (pp. 219-250). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Hayamizu, T. (1997). Between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation: Examination of reasons for academic study based on the theory of internalization. *Japanese Psychological Research*, 39, (2), 98-108.

Ho, D. Y. F. (1994). Cognitive socialization in Confucian heritage cultures. In F. M. Greenfield, & R. R. Cocking (Eds.), *Cross cultural roots of minority child development* (pp. 285-313). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Hofstede, G. (1991). *Organizations and cultures: Software of the mind*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Jacobs, J. A.., & Eccles J. (2000). Parents, task values, and real-life achievement-related choices. In C. Sansone & J. Harackiewicz (Eds.), *Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation: The search for optimal motivation and performance* (pp. 405-439). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Kim, J. (2000). Historical development. In J. C. Wiedman, & N. Park (Eds.), *Higher education in Korea: Tradition and adaptation* (pp. 7-53). New York: Falmer Press.

Kim, U., & Choi, S. (1994). Individualism, collectivism and child development: A Korean perspective. In P. M. Greenfield, & R. R. Cocking (Eds.). *Cross cultural roots of minority child development* (pp. 227-257). Hillsdale, NJ: Laurence Erlbaum.

King, A. Y. C., & Bond, M. H. (1985). The Confucian paradigm of man: A sociological view. In W. T. Tseng & D. Wu (Eds.), *Chinese culture and mental health* (pp. 29-46). New York: Academic Press.

Koestner, R., Losier, G. F., Fichman, L., & Mallet, M. (1998). *When intrinsic motivation is not enough: Identification toward school activities and successful adaptation among teenagers*. Unpublished manuscript, McGill University, Department of Pscychology, Montreal, Canada.

Kohn, A. (1993). *Punished by rewards: The trouble with gold stars incentive plans, A's, praise and other bribes*. New York: Houghton Mifflin.

Krashen, S. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications*. London: Longman.

Lantolf, J. P. (Ed.) (2000). *Sociocultural theory and second language learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lantolf, J. P. & Appel, G. (Eds.). (1994). *Vygotskian approaches to second language research*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Lee, O., & Brophy, J. (1996). Motivational patterns observed in sixth-grade science classrooms. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 33, 303-318.

Lett, D. P. (1998). *In pursuit of status: The making of South Korea's "New" urban middle class*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Asian Center.

Levesque, C., Stanek, L. R., Zuehlke, A. N., & Ryan, R. M. (2004). Autonomy and competence in German and American university students: A comparative study based on self-determination theory. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 96, (1), 68-84.

Losier, G., & Koestner, R. (1999). Intrinsic versus identified regulation in distinct political campaigns: The consequences of following politics for pleasure versus personal meaningfulness. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 25, 287-298.

Lukmani, M. (1972). Motivation to learn a second language and second language proficiency. *Language Learning*, 7, 261-273.

Lynn, R. (1988). *Educational achievement in Japan: Lessons for the west*. NewYork: M. E. Sharpe.

McClelland, N. (1999). The influence of various motivational factors on foreign-language learning. In S. Cornell, & P. Robinson (Eds.), *Proceedings of conference in Individual differences in foreign language learning: Effects of aptitude, intelligence, and motivation* (pp.99-103). Tokyo, Japan: Aoyama Gakuin University.

McDonald, C. H. (1982). *A validation of cognitive evaluation theory*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwestern Psychological Association, Minneapolis, MI., May 6-8, 1982.

Moll, L. (Ed.). (1990). *Vygotsky and education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Noels, K. A., Clément, R., & Pelletier, L. G. (1999). Perceptions of teacher communicative style and students' intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. *Modern Language Journal*, 83, 23-34.

Noels, K. A., Clément, R., & Pelletier, L. G. (2001). Intrinsic, extrinsic, and integrative orientations of French Canadian learners of English. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57, 3, 424-442.

Noels, K. A., Pelletier, L. G., & Vallerand, R. J. (2003). Why are you learning a second language? Motivational orientations and self-determination theory. *Language Learning*, 53, 33-63.

Oller, J. W., Hudson, A. J., & Liu, P. F. (1977). Attitudes and attained proficiency in ESL: A sociolinguistic study of native speakers of Chinese in the United States. *Language Learning*, 77, 1-27.

Oxford, R. L. (1994). Where are we regarding language learning motivation? *Modern Language Journal*, 78, 512-514.

Oxford, R. L. (Ed.). (1996). *Language learning motivation: Pathways to the new century*. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i Press.

Oxford, R. L. (Ed.). (1999). *Language learning motivation: Pathways to the new century (2nd Edition)*. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i Press.

Oxford, R. L., & Shearin, J. (1994). Language learning motivation: Expanding the theoretical framework. *Modern Language Journal*, 78, 12-28.

Pintrich, P., & Schunk, D. (2002). *Motivation in education: Theory, research and applications (2nd Edition)*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall

Pritchard, R. D., Campbell, K. M., & Campbell, D. J. (1977). Effects of extrinsic financial rewards on intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 62, (1), 9-15.

Rogers, B. T. (1985). Cognitive evaluation theory: The effects of external rewards on intrinsic motivation of gifted students. *Roeper Review* 7, (4), 257-260.

Rozman, G. (Ed.). (1991). *The East Asian region: Confucian heritage and its m*odern *adaptation*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Ryan, R. M. (1995). Psychological needs and the facilitation of integrative progresses. *Journal of Personality*, 63, 397-427.

Ryan, R. M., & Connell, J. P. (1989). Perceived locus of causality and internalization: Examining reasons for acting in two domains. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57, 749-761.

Ryan, R. M., & La Guardia, J. G. (1999). Achievement motivation within a pressured society: Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations to learn and the politics of school reform. In Urdan, T. C. (Ed.), *Advances in Motivation and Achievement*, 11, 45-85. Stamford, CT: JAI Press.

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25, 54-67.

Schmidt, R., Boraie, D., & Kassabgy, O. (1999). Foreign language motivation: Internal structure and external connections. In R. L. Oxford (Ed.), *Language learning motivation: Pathways to the new century* (pp.9-70). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i Press.

Schunk, D. H., & Zimmerman, B. J. (Eds.). (1998). *Self-regulated learning: From teaching to self-regulated practice*. New York: Guilford Press.

Seth, M. J. (2002). *Education fever: Society, politics, and the pursuit of schooling in South Korea*. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i Press.

Skinner, B. (1953). *Science and human behavior*. New York: Free Press.

Stipek, D. (2002). *Motivation to learn: Integrating theory and practice (4th Edition)*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Thorndike, E. (1932). *The fundamentals of learning*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Tremblay, P. E., & Gardner, R. C. (1994). On motivation, research agendas, and theoretical perspectives. *Modern Language Journal*, 79, 359-368.

Tremblay, P. E., & Gardner, R. C. (1995). Expanding the motivation construct in language learning. *Modern Language Journal*, 79, 505-520.

Triandis, H. C. (1995). Motivation and achievement in collectivist and individualist cultures. In M. L. Maehr, & P.R. Pintrich (Eds.), *Advances in motivation and achievement* (pp.1-30). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press Inc.

Vallerand, R. J. (1997). Toward a hierarchical model of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 29, 271-360.

Vallerand, R. J., Blais, M. R., Brière, N. M., & Pelletier, L. G. (1989). Construction and validation of the Academic Motivation Scale. *Revue Canadienne des Sciences du Comportement*, 21, 323-349.

Vallerand, R. J., Pelletier, L. G., Blais, M. R., Brière, N. M., Senécal, C., & Vallières, E. F. (1992). The academic motivation scale: A measure of intrinsic, extrinsic, and amotivation in education. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 52, 1003-1017.

Vallerand, R. J., & Ratelle. C. F. (2002). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation: A hierarchical model. In E. L. Deci, & R. M. Ryan (Eds.), *Handbook of self-determination research* (pp. 37-63). Rochester, New York: Rochester University Press.

van Lier, L. (1996). *Interaction in the language classroom*. New York: Longman.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Watkins, D. A., & Biggs, J. B. (1996). *The Chinese learner: Cultural psychological & contextual influences*. CERC, Hong Kong: Oregon State University.

Watson, J. (1924). *Behaviorism*. New York: Norton.

Weidman, J. C., & Park, N. (Eds.). (2000). *Higher education in Korea*. New York: Falmer Press.

Weiner, B. (1992). *Human motivation: Metaphors, theories and research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Williams, M., & Burden, B. (1997). *Psychology for language teachers: A social constructivist approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Yamauchi, H., & Tanaka, K. (1998). Relations of autonomy, self-referenced beliefs, and self-regulated learning among Japanese children. *Psychological Reports*, 82, 803-816.

Vita

Bokyung Murray was born in Chunju, Republic of Korea on March 7, 1963, the daughter of Yeja Kim and Jongok Kim. After graduation from the Sangmyung University with a B.A. in English education in 1986, she worked as an English teacher at Youngpa Girls' Middle School and Youngpa Girls' High school in Seoul, Korea for ten years. She then entered the University of Nevada at Las Vegas graduating with an M.S. in TESL (Teaching English as a Second Language) in 2002. In August, 2002, Bokyung entered the PhD program in the Foreign Language Education Department, The University of Texas at Austin. During this time, she presented research and published articles in the Texas Papers in Foreign Language Education Journal in 2003, the Korean Association of Teachers of English Journal in 2004, and Topics in Education Journal in 2005.

In May, 2005, Bokyung assumed the position of Assistant Professor, Asian Language Department, Defense Language Institute, Monterey, California.

Permanent address: 89 Ocean Pines Lane, Pebble Beach, CA. 93953

This dissertation was typed by the author.